This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 02265574 4

Digitized by Google

LENOX LIBRARY

210

Duyckinck Collection.
Presented in 1878.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

YAB

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

Philosophical Dictionary.

FROM THE FRENCH OF

M. DE VOLTAIRE.

Without Philosophy, we should be little above the animals that dig or erect their habitations, prepare their food in them, take care of their little ones in their dwellings, and have, besides, the good fortune, which we have not, of being born ready-clothed.

Article ANTIQUITY, Vol. I. p. 177.

How charming is divine Philosophy!
Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,
But musical as is Apollo's lute,
And a perpetual feast of nectar'd sweets,
Where no crude surfeit reigns.

MILTON'S COMUS, Scene 2.

VOLUME V.

LONDON, 1824:
PRINTED FOR JOHN AND HENRY L. HUNT,
TAVISTOCK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

JNE

Digitized by Google

LENOX LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON:
PRINTED BY G. E. REYNELL, BROAD-STREET, GOLDEN-SQUARE.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

	Page
Martyrs	1
Mass	14
Massacres	19
Master	20
Matter	22
Meetings (Public)	27
Messiah	28
Metamorphosis	42
Metaphysics	43
Mind (Limits of the Human)	44
Miracles	45
Mission	66
Money	68
Monsters	75
Morality	78
Moses	79
Motion	95
Mountain	98
Nail	99
Nature	100
Necessary—Necessity	103
New—Novelties	106
Newton and Descartes	107
Nudity	119
Number	120
Numbering	123
Occult Qualities	130
Offences (Local)	131
Onan	132
Opinion	134
Optimism	135
Oracles	142
Ordeal	155
Ordination	161
Original Sin	163
Orthography	169
Ovid	170
Paradise	178

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

	Page
Parliament of France	180
Parliament of England	191
Passions	195
Paul	198
Persecution	205
Peter (Saint)	206
Peter the Great and J. J. Rousseau	213
Philosopher	217
Philosophy	230
Physicians	237
Pirates, or Buccaneers	240
Plagiarism	242
Plato	244
Poets	251
Poisonings	254
Policy	259
Polypus	264
Polytheism	266
Popery	271
Populatisu	273
Possessed	283
Post	284
Power—Omnipotence	286
Power	292
Prayer (Public), Thanksgiving, &c.	299
Prejudice	305
Presbyterian	308
Pretensions	309
Pride	314
Priests	315
Priests of the Pagans	316
Prior, Butler, and Swift	318
Privilege—Privileged Cases	323
Property	326
Prophecies	331
Prophets	341
Providence	343
Purgatory	345
Quack (or Charlatan)	352
Quakers	356
Question—Torture	371
Quete, (Collection—Gathering)	373
Quisquis (of) Ramus	379
Rare	381
Ravaillac	384
Reasonable, or Right	387
Relics	389
Religion	396
Rhyme	415

Digitized by Google

A

PHILOSOPHICAL DICTIONARY.

MARTYRS.

SECTION I.

MARTYR, 'witness;' martyrdom, 'testimony.' The early christian community at first gave the name of 'martyrs' to those who announced new truths to mankind, who gave testimony to Jesus, who confessed Jesus; in the same manner as they gave the name of 'saints' to the presbyters, to the supervisors of the community, and to their female benefactors; this is the reason why St. Jerome, in his letters, often calls his initiated Paul, Saint Paul. All the first bishops were called saints.

Subsequently, the name of martyrs was given only to deceased christians, or to those who had been tortured for punishment; and the little chapels that were erected to them, received afterwards the name of 'martyrion.'

It is a great question, why the Roman empire always tolerated in its bosom the Jewish sect, even after the two horrible wars of Titus and Adrian; why it tolerated the worship of Isis at several times; and why it frequently persecuted christianity. It is evident, that the Jews, who paid dearly for their synagogues, denounced the christians as mortal foes, and excited the people against them. It is moreover evident, that the Jews

Digitized by Google

occupied with the trade of brokers and usury, did not preach against the ancient religion of the empire, and that the christians, who were all busy in controversy, preached against the public worship, sought to destroy it, often burned the temples, and broke the consecrated statutes, as St. Theodosius did at Amasia, and St. Polyeuctus in Mitylene.

The orthodox christians, sure that their religion was the only true one, did not tolerate any other. In consequence, they themselves were hardly tolerated. Some of them were punished and died for the faith—and these were the martyrs.

This name is so respectable, that it ought not to be prodigally bestowed: it is not right to assume the name and arms of a family to which one does not belong. Very heavy penalties have been established against those who have the audacity to decorate themselves with the cross of Malta or of St. Louis, without being chevaliers of those orders.

The learned Dodwell, the dextrous Middleton, the judicious Blondel, the exact Tillemont, the scrutinizing Launoy, and many others, all zealous for the glory of the true martyrs, have excluded from their catalogue an obscure multitude on whom this great title had been lavished. We have remarked, that these learned men were sanctioned by the direct acknowledgment of Origen, who, in his "Refutation of Celsus," confesses that there are very few martyrs, and those at a great distance of time, and that it is easy to recken them.

Nevertheless, the benedictine Ruinart—who calls himself Don Ruinart, although he was no Spaniard—has contradicted all these learned persons! He has candidly given us many stories of martyrs which have appeared to the critics very suspicious. Many sensible persons have doubted various anecdotes relating to the legends recounted by Don Ruinart, from beginning to end.

1. *Of Saint Symphorosia and her Seven Children.*

Their scruples commence with St. Symphorosia and her seven children who suffered martyrdom with her;

Digitized by Google

which appears, at first sight, too much imitated from the seven Maccabees. It is not known whence this legend comes; and that it is at once a great cause of scepticism.

It is therein related, that the emperor Adrian himself wished to interrogate the unknown Symphorosia, to ascertain if she was a christian. This would have been more extraordinary than if Louis XIV. had subjected a huguenot to an interrogatory. You will further observe, that Adrian, far from being a persecutor of the christians, was their greatest protector.

He had then a long conversation with Symphorosia, and putting himself in a passion, he said to her, "I will sacrifice you to the gods;" as if the Roman emperors sacrificed women in their devotions. In the sequel, he caused her to be thrown into the Anio—which was not an usual mode of immolation. He afterwards had one of her sons cloven in two from the top of his head to his middle; a second from side to side; a third was broken on the wheel; a fourth was only stabbed in the stomach; a fifth right to the heart; a sixth had his throat cut; the seventh died of a parcel of needles thrust into his breast. The emperor Adrian was fond of variety. He commanded that they should be buried near the temple of Hercules,—although no one is ever buried in Rome, much less near the temples, which would have been a horrible profanation. The legend adds, that the chief priest of the temple named the place of their interment, "the Seven Biotanates."

If it was extraordinary that a monument should be erected at Rome to persons thus treated, it was no less so that a high priest should concern himself with the inscription; and further, that this Roman priest should make a Greek epitaph for them. But what is still more strange is, that it is pretended that this word 'Biotanates' signifies the seven tortured. 'Biotanates' is a fabricated word, which one does not meet with in any author; and this signification can only be given to it by a play upon words, falsely using the word 'thenon.' There is scarcely any fable worse constructed. The

Digitized by Google

writers of legends knew how to lie, but none of them knew how to lie skilfully.

The learned Lacroze, librarian to Frederick the Great, king of Prussia, observed—"I know not whether Ruinart is sincere, but I am afraid he is silly."

2. *Of Saint Felicita and seven more Children.*

It is from Surius that this legend is taken. This Surius is rather notorious for his absurdities. He was a monk of the sixteenth century, who writes about the martyrs of the second as if he had been present.

He pretends, that that wicked man, that tyrant, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius, ordered the prefect of Rome to institute a process against St. Felicita, to have her and her seven children put to death, because there was a rumour that she was a christian.

The prefect held his tribunal in the Campus Martius, —which however was at that time, used only for the reviewing of troops;—and the first thing the prefect did was, to cause a blow to be given her in full assembly.

The long discourses of the magistrate and the accused are worthy of the historian. He finishes by putting the seven brothers to death by different punishments, like the seven children of St. Symphorosa. This is only a duplicate affair. But as for St. Felicita, he leaves her there, and does not say another word about her.

3. *Of Saint Polycarp.*

Eusebius relates, that St. Polycarp, being informed in a dream, that he should be burnt in three days, made it known to his friends. The legend-maker adds, that the lieutenant of police at Smyrna, whose name was Herodius, had him seized by his archers; that he was abandoned to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre; that the sky opened, and a heavenly voice cried to him—"Be of good courage, Polycarp;" that the hour of letting loose the lions in the amphitheatre having passed, the people went about collecting wood from all the houses to burn him with; that the saint ad-

Digitized by Google

dressed himself to the God of the 'archangels' (although the word archangel was not then known;) that the flames formed themselves round him into a triumphal arch without touching him; that his body had the smell of baked bread; but that having resisted the fire, he could not preserve himself from a sabre-cut; that his blood put out the burning pile, and that there sprung from it a dove which flew straight to heaven. To which planet, is not precisely known.

4. *Of Saint Ptolomais.*

We follow the order of Don Ruinart; but we have no wish to call in question the martyrdom of St. Ptolomais, which is extracted from St. Justin's Apology.

We could make some difficulties with regard to the woman who was accused by her husband of being a christian, and who baffled him by giving him a bill of divorce. We might ask why, in this history, there is no further mention of this woman? We might make it manifest, that in the time of Marcus Aurelius, women were not permitted to demand divorce from their husbands; that this permission was only granted them under the emperor Julian; and that this so much repeated story of the christian woman who repudiated her husband (whilst no pagan would have dared to imagine such a thing) cannot well be other than a a fable. But we do not desire to raise unpleasant disputes. As for the little probability there is in the compilation of Don Ruinart, we have too much respect for the subject he treats of to start objections.

We have not made any to the Letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons, because there is still a great deal of obscurity connected with it; but we shall be pardoned for defending the memory of the great Marcus Aurelius, thus outraged in the life of St. Symphorian of Autun, who was probably a relation of St. Symphorosia.

5. *Of Saint Symphorian of Autun.*

This legend, the author of which is unknown, begins thus:—"The emperor Marcus Aurelius had just

Digitized by Google

raised a frightful tempest against the church, and his fulminating edicts assailed on all sides the religion of Jesus Christ, at the time when Saint Symphorian lived at Autun in all the splendour that high birth and uncommon virtue can confer. He was of a christian family, one of the most considerable of the city," &c.

Marcus Aurelius issued no sanguinary edicts against the christians. It is a very criminal calumny. Tillemont himself admits, "that he was the best prince the Romans ever had; that his reign was a golden age; and that he verified what he often quoted from Plato, that nations would only be happy when kings were philosophers."

Of all the emperors this was he who promulgated the best laws: he protected the wise, but persecuted no christians, of whom he had a great many in his service.

The writer of the legend relates, that St. Symphorian having refused to adore Cybele, the city judge enquired, "Who is this man?" Now it is impossible that the judge of Autun should not have known the most considerable person in Autun.

He was declared by the sentence to be guilty of treason 'divine and human.' The Romans never employed this formula; and that alone should deprive the pretended martyr of Autun of all credit.

In order the better to refute this calumny against the sacred memory of Marcus Aurelius, let us bring under view the discourse of Meliton, bishop of Sardis, to this best of emperors, reported verbatim by Eusebius:—*

"The continual succession of good fortune which has attended the empire, without its happiness being disturbed by a single disgrace, since our religion which was born with it has grown in its bosom, is an evident proof that it contributes eminently to its greatness and glory. Among all the emperors, Nero and Domitian alone, deceived by certain impostors, have spread calumnies against us, which, as usual, have found some partial credence among the people. But your pious

* Eusebius, p. 187, translation of Cousin, 4to.

Digitized by Google

ancestors have corrected the people's ignorance, and by public edicts have repressed the audacity of those who attempted to treat us ill. Your grandfather Adrian wrote in our favour to Fundanus, governor of Asia, and to many other persons. The emperor your father, during the period when you divided with him the cares of government, wrote to the inhabitants of Larissa, of Thessalonica, of Athens, and in short to all the people of Greece, to repress the seditions and tumults which had been excited against us."

This declaration by a most pious, learned, and veracious bishop, is sufficient to confound for ever all the lies and legends which may be regarded as the Arabian tales of christianity.

6. *Of another Saint Felicita, and of Saint Perpetua.*

If it were an object to dispute the legend of Felicita and Perpetua, it would not be difficult to show how suspicious it is. These Carthaginian martyrs are only known by a writing, without date, of the church of Saltzbourg. Now, it is a great way from this part of Bavaria to Goletta. We are not informed under what emperor this Felicita and this Perpetua received the crown of martyrdom. The astounding sights with which this history is filled, do not discover a very profound historian. A ladder entirely of gold, bordered with lances and swords; a dragon at the top of the ladder; a large garden near the dragon; sheep from which an old man drew milk; a reservoir full of water; a bottle of water whence they drank without diminishing the liquid; St. Perpetua fighting entirely naked against a wicked Egyptian; some handsome young men all naked who took her part; herself at last become a man and a vigorous wrestler;—these are, it appears to me, conceits which ought not to have place in a respectable book.

There is one other reflection very important to make. It is, that the style of all these stories of martyrdoms which took place at such different periods, is everywhere alike, everywhere equally puerile and bombastic. You find the same turns of expression,

Digitized by Google

the same phrases, in the history of a martyr under Domitian and of another under Galerius. There are the same epithets, the same exaggerations. By the little we understand of style, we perceive that the same hand has compiled them all.

I do not here pretend to make a book against Don Ruinart; and while I always respect, admire, and invoke the true martyrs with the holy church, I confine myself to making it perceived, by one or two striking examples, how dangerous it is to mix what is purely ridiculous with what ought to be venerated.

7. *Of Saint Theodotus of the City of Ancyra, and of the Seven Virgins; written by Nisus, an Eye-witness, and extracted from Bollandus.*

Many critics, as eminent for wisdom as for true piety, have already given us to understand, that the legend of St. Theodotus the publican is a profanation and a species of impiety which ought to have been suppressed. The following is the story of Theodotus. We shall often employ the exact words of the 'Genuine Acts' compiled by Don Ruinart.

"His trade of publican supplied him with the means of exercising his episcopal functions. Illustrious tavern! consecrated to piety instead of debauchery. * * * Sometimes Theodotus was a physician, sometimes he furnished tit-bits to the faithful. A tavern was seen to be to the christians what Noah's ark was to those whom God wished to save from the deluge."*

This publican Theodotus walking by the river Halis with his companions, towards a town adjacent to the city of Ancyra, "a fresh and soft plot of turf offered them a delicious couch; a spring which issued a few steps off, from the foot of the rock, and which by a channel crowned with flowers came running past them in order to quench their thirst, offered them clear and pure water. Trees bearing fruit, mixed with wild

* What is between marks of quotation is word for word as in the 'Genuine Acts;' all the rest is strictly agreeable to their meaning. We have only abridged, in order to avoid the tedium of the declamatory style of these Acts.

Digitized by Google

ones, furnished them with shade and fruits; and an assemblage of skilful nightingales, whom the grasshoppers relieved every now and then, formed a charming concert," &c.

The clergyman of the place, named Fronton, having arrived, and the publican having drank with him on the grass, "the fresh green of which was relieved by the various gradations of colour in the flowers, he said to the clergyman—'Ah, father! what a pleasure it would be to build a chapel here.'—'Yes,' said Fronton, 'but it would be necessary to have some relics to begin with.' 'Well, well,' replied St. Theodotus, 'you shall have some soon, I give you my word; here is my ring which I give you as a pledge;—build your chapel quickly.'"

The publican had the gift of prophecy, and knew well what he was saying. He went away to the city of Ancyra, while the clergyman Fronton set himself about building. He found there the most horrible persecution, which lasted very long. Seven christian virgins, of whom the youngest was seventy years old, had just been condemned, according to custom, to lose their virginity, through the agency of all the young men of the city. The youth of Ancyra, who had probably more urgent affairs, were in no hurry to execute the sentence. One only could be found obedient to justice. He applied himself to St. Thecusa, and carried her into a closet with surprising courage. Thecusa threw herself on her knees, and said to him, "For God's sake, my son, a little shame! Behold these lack-lustre eyes, this half dead flesh, these greasy wrinkles which seventy years have ploughed in my forehead, this face of the colour of the earth; abandon thoughts so unworthy of a young man like you—Jesus Christ entreats you by my mouth. He asks it of you as a favour, and if you grant it him, you may expect his entire gratitude." The discourse of the old woman, and her countenance, made the executioner recollect himself. The seven virgins were not deflowered.

The irritated governor sought for another punishment: he caused them to be initiated forthwith in the

Digitized by Google

mysteries of Diana and Minerva. It is true, that great feasts had been instituted in honour of those divinities, but the mysteries of Diana and Minerva were not known to antiquity. St. Nil, an intimate friend of the publican Theodotus, and the author of this marvellous story, was not quite correct.

According to him, these seven pretty lasses were placed quite naked on the car which carried the great Diana and the wise Minerva to the banks of a neighbouring lake. The Thucydides St. Nil still appears to be very ill-informed here. The priestesses were always covered with veils; and the Roman magistrates never caused the goddesses of chastity and wisdom to be attended by girls who showed themselves both before and behind to the people.

St. Nil adds, that the car was preceded by two choirs of priestesses of Bacchus, who carried the thyrses in their hands. St. Nil has here mistaken the priestesses of Minerva for those of Bacchus. He was not versed in the liturgy of Ancyra.

Entering the city, the publican saw this sad spectacle—the governor, the priestesses, the car, Minerva, Diana, and the seven maidens. He runs to throw himself on his knees in a hut, along with a nephew of St. Thecusa. He beseeches heaven, that the seven ladies should be dead rather than naked. His prayer is heard; he learns that the seven damsels, instead of being deflowered, have been thrown into the lake with a stone round their necks, by order of the governor. Their virginity is in safe keeping. At this news, the saint, raising himself from the ground and placing himself upon his knees, turned his eyes towards heaven; and in the midst of the various emotions he experienced of love, joy, and gratitude, he said, "I give thee thanks, O Lord! that thou hast not rejected the prayer of thy servant."

He slept; and during his sleep, St. Thecusa, the youngest of the drowned women, appeared to him. "How now, son Theodotus!" she said, "you are sleeping without thinking of us: have you forgotten so soon the care I took of your youth? Do not, dear

Digitized by Google

Theodotus, suffer our bodies to be devoured by the fishes. Go to the lake, but beware of a traitor."

This traitor was in fact the nephew of St. Thecusa.

I omit here a multitude of miraculous adventures that happened to the publican, in order to come to the most important. A celestial cavalier, armed cap-à-pie, preceded by a celestial flambeau, descends from the height of the empyream, conducts the publican to the lake in the midst of storms, drives away all the soldiers who guard the shore, and gives Theodotus time to fish up the seven old women and to bury them.

The nephew of St. Thecusa unfortunately went and told all. Theodotus was seized, and for three days all sorts of punishments were tried in vain to kill him. They could only attain their object by cleaving his scull; an operation which saints are never proof against.

He was still to be buried. His friend the minister Fronton, to whom Theodotus, in his capacity of publican, had given two leathern bottles filled with wine, made the guards drunk, and carried off the body. Theodotus then appeared in body and spirit to the minister. Well, my friend, he said to him; did I not say well, that you should have relics for your chapel?

Such is what is narrated by St. Nil, an eye-witness, who could neither be deceived nor deceive; such is what Don Ruinart has quoted as a genuine act. Now every man of sense, every intelligent christian, will ask himself, whether a better mode could be adopted of dishonouring the most holy and venerated religion in the world, and of turning it into ridicule?

I shall not speak of the Eleven Thousand Virgins; I shall not discuss the fable of the Theban legion, composed (says the author) of six thousand six hundred men, all christians coming from the east by Mount St. Bernard, suffering martyrdom in the year 286, the period of the most profound peace as regarded the church, and in the gorge of a mountain where it is impossible to place 300 men a-breast; a fable written more than 550 years after the event; a fable in which

Digitized by Google

a king of Burgundy is spoken of who never existed; a fable in short acknowledged to be absurd by all the learned who have not lost their reason.*

Behold what Don Ruinart narrates seriously! Let us pray to God for the good sense of Don Ruinart!

SECTION II.

How does it happen that, in the enlightened age in which we live, learned and useful writers are still found who nevertheless follow the stream of old errors, and who corrupt many truths by admitted fables? They reckon the era of the martyrs from the first year of the empire of Dioclesian, who was then far enough from inflicting martyrdom on anybody. They forget that his wife Prisca was a christian, that the principal officers of his household were christians; that he protected them constantly during eighteen years; that they built at Nicomedia a church more sumptuous than his palace; and that they would never have been persecuted if they had not outraged the Cæsar Valerius.

Is it possible that any one should still dare to assert, "that Dioclesian died of age, despair, and misery;"—he who was seen to quit life like a philosopher, as he had quitted the empire; he who, solicited to resume the supreme power, loved better to cultivate his fine gardens at Salona, than to reign again over the whole of the then known world?

Oh ye compilers! will you never cease to compile? You have usefully employed your three fingers; employ still more usefully your reason.

What! You repeat to me that St. Peter reigned over the faithful at Rome for twenty-five years, and that Nero had him put to death together with St. Paul, in order to revenge the death of Simon the magician, whose legs they had broken by their prayers?

To report such fables, though with the best motive, is to insult christianity.

---

* Here follows the silly legend of St. Romanus, already given.—T.

Digitized by Google

The poor creatures who still repeat these absurdities, are copyists who renew in octavo and duodecimo old stories that honest men no longer read, and who have never opened a book of wholesome criticism. They rake up the antiquated tales of the church; they know nothing of either Middleton, or Dodwell, or Bruker, or Dumoulin, or Fabricius, or Grabius, or even Dupin, or of any one of those who have lately carried light into the darkness.

SECTION III.

We are fooled with martyrdoms that make us break out into laughter. The Tituses, the Trajans, the Marcus Aureliuses, are painted as monsters of cruelty. Fleuri, abbé of Loc Dieu, has disgraced his ecclesiastical history by tales which a sensible old woman would not tell to little children.

Can it be seriously repeated, that the Romans condemned seven virgins, each seventy years old, to pass through the hands of all the young men of the city of Ancyra—those Romans who punished the Vestals with death for the least gallantry?

A hundred tales of this sort are found in the martyrologies. The narrators have hoped to render the ancient Romans odious, and they have rendered themselves ridiculous. Do you want good well-authenticated barbarities—good and well-attested massacres, rivers of blood which have actually flowed—fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, infants at the breast, who have in reality had their throats cut, and been heaped on one another? Persecuting monsters! Seek these truths only in your own annals: you will find them in the crusades against the Albigenses, in the massacres of Merindol and Cabrière, in the frightful day of St. Bartholomew, in the massacres of Ireland, in the vallies of the Pays de Vaud. It becomes you well, barbarians as you are, to impute extravagant cruelties to the best of emperors; you who have deluged Europe with blood, and covered it with corpses, in order to prove that the same body can be in a thousand places at once, and that the pope can sell indulgences! Cease to calumniate the Romans,

Digitized by Google

your law-givers, and ask pardon of God for the abominations of your forefathers!

It is not the torture, you say, which makes martyrdom; it is the cause. Well! I agree with you that your victims ought not to be designated by the name of martyr, which signifies witness; but what name shall we give to your executioners? Phalaris and the Busiris were the gentlest of men in comparison with you. Does not your inquisition, which still remains, make reason, nature, and religion boil with indignation? Great God! If mankind should reduce to ashes that infernal tribunal, would they be unacceptable in thy avenging eyes?

MASS.

The mass, in ordinary language, is the greatest and most august of the ceremonies of the church. Different names are given to it, according to the rights practised in the various countries where it is celebrated; as the Mosarabian or Gothic mass, the Greek mass, the Latin mass. Durandus and Eckius call those masses dry, in which no consecration is made, as that which is appointed to be said in particular by aspirants to the priesthood; and cardinal Bona relates,* on the authority of William of Nangis, that St. Louis, in his voyage abroad, had it said in this manner, lest the motion of the vessel should spill the consecrated wine. He also quotes Génébrard, who says that he assisted at Turin, in 1587, at a similar mass, celebrated in a church, but after dinner and very late, for the funeral of a person of rank.

Pierre le Chantre also speaks of the two-fold, three-fold, and even four-fold mass, in which the priest celebrated the mass of the day or the feast, as far as the offertory, then began a second, third, and sometimes a fourth, as far as the same place; after which he said as many secretas as he had begun masses; he recited the canon only once for the whole; and at the end he

* Book i. chap. 15, on the Liturgy.

Digitized by Google

added as many collects as he had joined together masses.*

It was not until about the close of the fourth century that the word mass began to signify the celebration of the eucharist. The learned Beatus Rhenanus, in his notes on Tertullian,† observes, that St. Ambrose consecrated this popular expression, 'missa,' taken from the sending out of the catechumens, after the reading of the gospel.

In the Apostolical Constitutions,‡ we find a liturgy in the name of St. James, by which it appears, that instead of invoking the saints in the canon of the mass, the primitive church prayed for them. "We also offer to thee, O Lord," said the celebrator, "this bread and this chalice for all the saints that have been pleasing in thy sight from the beginning of ages: for the patriarchs, the prophets, the just, the apostles, the martyrs, the confessors, bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, readers, chaunters, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names are known unto thee." But St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who lived in the fourth century, substituted this explanation:—"After which," says he, we commemorate those who die before us, and first the patriarchs, apostles, and martyrs, that God may receive our prayers through their intercession."§ This proves (as will be said in the article RELICS) that the worship of the saints was then beginning to be introduced into the church.

Noel Alexander‖ cites acts of St. Andrew, in which that apostle is made to say,—"I offer up every day, on the altar of the only true God, not the flesh of bulls nor the blood of goats, but the unspotted lamb, which still remains living and entire after it is sacrificed, and all the faithful eat of its flesh;" but this learned dominican acknowledges that this piece was unknown

* Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticæ, vol. vi. book 15. chap. iv. art. 5.
† Book iv. against Marcion.
‡ Book viii. chap. 12.
§ Fifth Catechesis.
‖ Century 1, p. 109.

Digitized by Google

until the eighth century. The first who cited it was Ætherius, bishop of Osma in Spain, who wrote against Ælipard in 788.

Abdias relates* that St. John, being forewarned by the Lord of the termination of his career, prepared for death and recommended his church to God. He then had bread brought to him, which he took, and, lifting up his hands to heaven, blessed it, broke it, and distributed it among those who were present, saying,—"Let my portion be your's, and let your's be mine." This manner of celebrating the eucharist (which means thanksgiving) is more conformable to the institution of that ceremony.

St. Luke indeed informs us,† that Jesus, after distributing bread and wine among his apostles, who were supping with him, said to them,—"Do this in memory of me." St. Matthew,‡ and St. Mark§ say, moreover, that Jesus sang a hymn. St. John, who in his gospel mentions neither the distribution of the bread and wine, nor the hymn, speaks of the latter at great length in his Acts, of which we give the text, as quoted by the second council of Nice:‖—

"Before our Lord was taken by the Jews," says this well-beloved apostle of Jesus, "he assembled us all together, and said to us,—Let us sing a hymn in honour of the Father, after which we will execute the design we have conceived. He ordered us therefore to form a circle, holding one another by the hand; then, having placed himself in the middle of the circle, he said to us, Amen; follow me. Then he began the canticle, and said, Glory be to thee, O Father! We all answered, Amen. Jesus continued, saying, Glory to the Word, &c. Glory to the Spirit, &c. Glory to grace, &c. and the apostles constantly answered, Amen."

After some other doxologies, Jesus said, "I will save, and I will be saved, Amen. I will unbind, and

* Hist. Apostol. book iv. art. 22, 23.
† Chap. xxii. 19.
‡ Chap. xxvi. 30.
§ Chap. xiv. 26.
‖ Col. 358.

Digitized by Google

I will be unbound, Amen. I will be wounded, and I will wound, Amen. I will be born, and I will beget, Amen. I will eat, and I will be consumed, Amen. I will be hearkened to, and I will hearken, Amen. I will be comprehended by the spirit, being all spirit, all understanding, Amen. I will be washed, and I will wash, Amen. Grace brings dancing; I will play on the flute; all of you dance, Amen. I will sing sorrowful airs; now all of you lament, Amen."

St. Augustin, who begins a part of this hymn in his epistle to Ceretius,* gives also the following:—"I will deck, and I will be decked. I am a lamp to those who see me and know me. I am the door for all who will knock at it. Do you, who see what I do, be careful not to speak of it."

This dance of Jesus and the apostles is evidently imitated from that of the Egyptian therapeutæ, who danced after supper in their assemblies, at first divided into two choirs, then united the men and the women together, as at the feast of Bacchus, after swallowing plenty of celestial wine (as Philo says.†)

Besides we know, that according to the Jewish tradition, after their coming out of Egypt, and passing the Red Sea, whence the solemnity of the passover took its name,‡ Moses and his sister assembled two musical choirs, one composed of men, the other of women, who, while dancing, sung a canticle of thanksgiving. These instruments, instantaneously assembled, these choirs arranged with so much promptitude, the facility with which the songs and dances are executed, suppose a habitude in these two exercises much anterior to the moment of execution.

This usage was afterwards perpetrated among the Jews.§ The daughters of Shiloh were dancing according to custom, at the solemn feast of the Lord, when the young men of the tribe of Benjamin, to whom they had been refused for wives, carried them off by the

* Epist. 237.
† Treatise on the Contemplative Life.
‡ Exodus, xv. and Philo, Life of Moses, book i.
§ Judges, xxi. 21.

Digitized by Google

counsel of the old men of Israel. And at this day, in Palestine, the women, assembled near the tombs of their relatives, dance in a mournful manner, and utter cries of lamentation.*

We also know, that the first christians held among themselves agapæ, or feasts of charity, in memory of the last supper which Jesus celebrated with his apostles, from which the pagans took occasion to bring against them the most odious charges; on which, to banish every shadow of licentiousness, the pastors forbade the kiss of peace, that concluded the ceremony, to be given between persons of different sexes.† But various abuses, which were even then complained of by St. Paul,‡ and which the council of Gangres, in the year 324, vainly undertook to reform, at length caused the agapæ to be abolished in 397, by the third council of Carthage, of which the forty-first canon ordained, that the holy mysteries should be celebrated fasting.

It will not be doubted, that these feastings were accompanied by dances, when it is recollected that, according to Scaliger, the bishops were called in the Latin church 'præsules,' (from 'præsiliendo') only because they led off the dance. Héliot, in his History of the Monastic Orders, says also, that during the persecutions which disturbed the peace of the first christians, congregations were formed of men and women, who, after the manner of the Therapeutæ, retired into the deserts, where they assembled in the hamlets on Sundays and feast-days, and danced piously, singing the prayers of the church.

In Portugal, in Spain, and in Rousillon, solemn dances are still performed in honour of the mysteries of christianity. On every vigil of a feast of the Virgin, the young women assemble before the doors of the churches dedicated to her, and pass the night in dancing round, and singing hymns and canticles in honour of her. Cardinal Ximenes restored in his time,

* Le Brun's Travels.
† Thomassin, Disciple of the Church, part iii. ch. xlvii. no. 1.
‡ Corinthians, xi.

Digitized by Google

in the cathedral of Toledo, the ancient usage of the Mosarabian mass, during which dances are performed in the choir and the nave, with equal order and devotion. In France too, about the middle of the last century, the priests and all the people of Limoges might be seen dancing round in the collegiate church, singing—"Sant Marcian, pregas pernous, et nous epingaren per bous"—that is, "St. Martial, pray for us, and we will dance for you."

And lastly, the jesuit Menestirer, in the preface to his Treatise on Ballets, published in 1682, says, that he had himself seen the canons of some churches take the singing-boys by the hand on Easter-day, and dance in the choir, singing hymns of rejoicing. What has been said, in the article CALENDS, of the extravagant dances of the feast of fools, exhibits a part of the abuses which have caused dancing to be discontinued in the ceremonies of the mass, which, the greater their gravity, are the better calculated to impose on the simple.

MASSACRES.

IT is perhaps as difficult as it is useless to ascertain whether 'mazzacrium,' a word of the low Latin, is the root of 'massacre,' or whether 'massacre' is the root of 'mazzacrium.'

A massacre signifies a number of men killed. There was yesterday a great massacre near Warsaw—near Cracow. We never say—There has been a massacre of a man; yet we do say—A man has been massacred: in that case it is understood that he has been killed barbarously by many blows.

Poetry makes use of the word 'massacred' for killed, assassinated.

Que par ses propres mains son père massacré.—*Cinna.*

An Englishman has made a compilation of all the massacres perpetrated on account of religion since the first centuries of our vulgar era.*

* See the work entitled "Dieu et les Hommes," ch. xlii.

Digitized by Google

I have been very much tempted to write against the English author; but his memoir not appearing to be exaggerated, I have restrained myself. For the future I hope there will be no more such calculations to make. But to whom shall we be indebted for that?

MASTER.

SECTION I.

How unfortunate am I to have been born! said Ardassan Ougli, a young icoglan of the grand sultan of the Turks. Yet, if I depended only on the sultan—but I am also subject to the chief of my oda, to the cassigi bachi; and when I receive my pay, I must prostrate myself before a clerk of the teftardar, who keeps back half of it. I was not seven years old, when in spite of myself I was circumcised with great ceremony and was ill for a fortnight after it. The dervise who prays to us is also my master; an iman is still more my master, and the mullah still more so than the iman. The cadi is another master, the kadeslesker a greater; the mufti a greater than all these together. The kiaia of the grand vizier with one word could cause me to be thrown into the canal; and finally, the grand vizier could have me beheaded, and the skin of my head stripped off, without any person caring about the matter.

Great God, how many masters! If I had as many souls and bodies as I have duties to fulfil, I could not bear it. Oh Allah! why hast thou not made me an owl? I should live free in my hole, and eat mice at my ease, without masters or servants. This is assuredly the true destiny of man; there were no masters until it was perverted; no man was made to serve another continually. If things were in order, each should charitably help his neighbour. The quick-sighted would conduct the blind; the active would be crutches to the lame. This world would be the paradise of Mahomet, instead of the hell which is formed precisely under the inconceivably narrow bridge.

Digitized by Google

Thus spoke Ardassan Ougli, after being bastinadoed by one of his masters.

Some years afterwards, Ardassan Ougli became a pacha with three tails. He made a prodigious fortune, and firmly believed that all men except the grand Turk and the grand vizier were born to serve him, and all women to give him pleasure according to his wishes.

SECTION II.

How can one man become the master of another? And by what kind of incomprehensible magic has he been able to become the master of several other men? A great number of good volumes have been written on this subject, but I give the preference to an Indian fable, because it is short, and fables explain everything.

Adimo, the father of all the Indians, had two sons and two daughters by his wife Pocriti. The eldest was a vigorous giant, the youngest was a little hunch-back, the two girls were pretty. As soon as the giant was strong enough, he lay with his two sisters, and caused the little hunch-back to serve him. Of his two sisters, the one was his cook, the other his gardener. When the giant would sleep, he began by chaining his little brother to a tree; and when the latter fled from him, he caught him in four strides, and gave him twenty blows with the strength of an ox.

The dwarf submitted, and became the best subject in the world. The giant, satisfied with seeing him fulfil the duties of a subject, permitted him to sleep with one of his sisters, with whom he was disgusted. The children who sprung from this marriage were not quite hunch-backs, but they were sufficiently deformed. They were brought up in the fear of God and of the giant. They received an excellent education; they were taught that their uncle was a giant by divine right, who could do what he pleased with all his family; that if he had some pretty niece or grand-niece, he should have her without difficulty, and not one should marry her unless he permitted it.

Digitized by Google

The giant dying, his son, who was neither so strong or so great as he was, believed himself to be like his father, a giant by divine right. He pretended to make all the men work for him, and slept with all the girls. The family leagued against him: he was killed, and they became a republic.

The Siamese pretend, that on the contrary the family commenced by being republican; and that the giant existed not until after a great many years and dissensions: but all the authors of Benares and Siam agree, that men lived an infinity of ages before they had the wit to make laws, and they prove it by an unanswerable argument, which is, that even at present, when all the world piques itself upon having wit, we have not yet found the means of making a score of laws passably good.

It is still, for example, an insoluble question in India, whether republics were established before or after monarchies; if confusion has appeared more horrible to men than despotism? I am ignorant how it happened in order of time, but in that of nature we must agree that men are all born equal: violence and ability made the first masters; laws have made the present.

MATTER.

SECTION I.

A polite Dialogue between a Demoniac and a Philosopher.

DEMONIAC.

Yes, thou enemy of God and man, who believest that God is all-powerful, and is at liberty to confer the gift of thought on every being whom he shall vouchsafe to choose, I will go and denounce thee to the inquisitor; I will have thee burned. Beware, I warn thee for the last time.

PHILOSOPHER.

Are these your arguments? Is it thus you teach mankind? I admire your mildness.

Digitized by Google

DEMONIAC.

Come, I will be patient for a moment, while the faggots are preparing. Answer me—What is spirit?

PHILOSOPHER.

I know not.

DEMONIAC.

What is matter?

PHILOSOPHER.

I scarcely know. I believe it to have extent, solidity, resistance, gravity, divisibility, mobility. God may have given it a thousand other qualities of which I am ignorant.

DEMONIAC.

A thousand other qualities, traitor! I see what thou wouldst be at: thou wouldst tell me that God can animate matter, that he has given instinct to animals, that he is the master of all.

PHILOSOPHER.

But it may very well be, that he has granted to this matter many properties which you cannot comprehend.

DEMONIAC.

Which I cannot comprehend, villain!

PHILOSOPHER.

Yes. His power goes much further than your understanding.

DEMONIAC.

His power! his power! thou talkest like a true atheist.

PHILOSOPHER.

However, I have the testimony of many holy fathers on my side.

DEMONIAC.

Go to, go to: neither God nor they shall prevent us from burning thee alive—the death inflicted on parricides and on philosophers who are not of our opinion.

PHILOSOPHER.

Was it the Devil or thyself that invented this method of arguing?

DEMONIAC.

Vile wretch! darest thou to couple my name with

Digitized by Google

the Devil's? (Here the demoniac strikes the philosopher, who returns him the blow with interest.)

PHILOSOPHER.

Help! philosophers!

DEMONIAC.

Holy brotherhood! help!

(Here half-a-dozen philosophers arrive on one side, and on the other rush in a hundred dominicans, with a hundred familiars of the inquisition, and a hundred alguazils. The contest is too unequal.)

SECTION II.

When wise men are asked, what is the soul? they answer, that they know not. If they are asked, what is matter? they make the same reply. It is true, that there are professors, and particularly scholars, who know all this perfectly; and when they have repeated that matter has extent and divisibility, they think they have said all: being pressed, however, to say what this thing is which is extended, they find themselves considerably embarrassed. It is composed of parts, say they. And of what are these parts composed? Are the elements of the parts divisible? Then they are mute, or they talk a great deal; which are equally suspicious. Is this almost unknown being called matter, eternal? Such was the belief of all antiquity. Has it of itself active force? Many philosophers have thought so. Have those who deny it a right to deny it? You conceive not that matter can have anything of itself; but how can you be assured that it has not of itself the properties necessary to it? You are ignorant of its nature, and you refuse it the modes which nevertheless are in its nature: for it can no sooner have been, than it has been in a certain fashion —it has had figure, and having necessarily figure, is it impossible that it should not have had other modes attached to its configuration? Matter exists, but you know it only by your sensations. Alas! of what avail have been all the subtleties of the mind since man first reasoned? Geometry has taught us many truths, metaphysics very few. We weigh matter, we measure

Digitized by Google

it, we decompose it; and if we seek to advance one step beyond these gross operations, we find ourselves powerless, and before us an immeasurable abyss.

Pray forgive all mankind who were deceived in thinking that matter existed by itself. Could they do otherwise? How are we to imagine that what is without succession has not always been? If it were not necessary for matter to exist, why should it exist? And if it was necessary that it should be, why should it not have been for ever? No axiom has ever been more universally received than this—"Of nothing, nothing comes." Indeed the contrary is incomprehensible. With every nation, chaos preceded the arrangement which a divine hand made of the whole world. The eternity of matter has with no people been injurious to the worship of the Divinity. Religion was never startled at the recognition of an eternal God as the master of an eternal matter. We of the present day are so happy as to know by faith, that God brought matter out of nothing; but no nation has ever been instructed in this dogma; even the Jews were ignorant of it. The first verse of Genesis says, that the Gods (Eloïm, not Eloï) made heaven and earth. It does not say, that heaven and earth were created out of nothing.

Philo, who lived at the only time when the Jews had any erudition, says, in his Chapter on the Creation, "God, being good by nature, bore no envy against substance, matter; which of itself had nothing good, having by nature only inertness, confusion, and disorder: it was bad, and he vouchsafed to make it good."

The idea of chaos put into order by a God, is to be found in all ancient theogonies. Hesiod repeated the opinion of the orientals, when he said in his Theogony, "Chaos was that which first existed." The whole Roman empire spoke in these words of Ovid—

> Sic ubi dispositam quisquis fuit ille Deorum
> Congeriem secuit.

Matter then, in the hands of God, was considered like clay under the potter's wheel, if these feeble images may be used to express his divine power.

Matter, being eternal, must have had eternal pro-

Digitized by Google

perties—as configuration, the vis inertiæ, motion, and divisibility. But this divisibility is only a consequence of motion; for without motion nothing is divided, nor separated, nor arranged. Motion therefore was regarded as essential to matter. Chaos had been a confused motion, and the arrangement of the universe was a regular motion, communicated to all bodies by the Master of the World. But how can matter have motion by itself, as it has, according to all the ancients, extent and divisibility?

But it cannot be conceived to be without extent, and it may be conceived to be without motion. To this it was answered,—It is impossible that matter should not be permeable; and being permeable, something must be continually passing through its pores. Why should there be passages, if nothing passes?

Reply and rejoinder might thus be continued for ever. The system of the eternity of matter, like all other systems, has very great difficulties. That of the formation of matter out of nothing, is no less incomprehensible. We must admit it, and not flatter ourselves with accounting for it: philosophy does not account for everything. How many incomprehensible things are we not obliged to admit, even in geometry! Can any one conceive two lines constantly approaching each other, yet never meeting?

Geometricians indeed will tell you, the properties of asymptotes are demonstrated; you cannot help admitting them;—but creation is not: why then admit it? Why is it hard for you to believe, like all the ancients, in the eternity of matter? The theologian will press you on the other side, and say,—If you believe in the eternity of matter, then you acknowledge two principles—God and matter; you fall into the error of Zoroaster and of Manes.

No answer can be given to the geometricians, for those folks know of nothing but their lines, their superfices, and their solids; but you may say to the theologians,—Wherein am I a Manichean? Here are stones which an architect has not made, but of which he has erected an immense building. I do not admit

Digitized by Google

two architects: the rough stones have obeyed power and genius.

Happily, whatever system a man embraces, it is in no way hurtful to morality; for what imports it whether matter is made or arranged? God is still an absolute master. Whether chaos was created out of nothing, or only reduced to order, it is still our duty to be virtuous; scarcely any of these metaphysical questions affect the conduct of life. It is with disputes as with table-talk; each one forgets after dinner what he has said, and goes whithersoever his interest or his inclination calls him.

MEETINGS (PUBLIC).

MEETING, 'assemblée,' is a general term applicable to any collection of people for secular, sacred, political, conversational, festive, or corporate purposes; in short, to all occasions on which numbers meet together.

It is a term which prevents all verbal disputes, and all abusive and injurious implications by which men are in the habit of stigmatising societies to which they do not themselves belong.

The legal meeting or assembly of the Athenians was called the 'church.'*

This word church, being peculiarly appropriated among us to express a convocation of catholics in one place, we did not in the first instance apply it to the public assembly of protestants; but used indeed the expression—'a flock of Huguenots.' Politeness however, which in time explodes all noxious terms, at length employed for the purpose the term assembly or meeting, which offends no one.

In England, the dominant church applies the name of 'meeting' to the churches of all the non-conformists.

The word assembly is particularly suitable to a collection of persons invited to go and pass their evening at a house where the host receives them with courtesy

* See article CHURCH.

Digitized by Google

and kindness, and where play, conversation, supper, and dancing, constitute their amusements. If the number invited be small, it is not called an 'assembly,' but a rendezvous of friends; and friends are never very numerous.

Assemblies are called, in Italian, 'conversazione,' 'ridotto.' The word 'ridotto' is properly what we once signified by the word 'reduit,' intrenchment; but 'reduit' having sunk into a term of contempt among us, our editors translated 'ridotto' by redoubt. The papers informed us, among the important intelligence contained in them relating to Europe, that many noblemen of the highest consideration went to take chocolate at the house of the princess Borghese; and that there was a redoubt there. It was announced to Europe, in another paragraph, that there would be a redoubt on the following Tuesday at her excellency's the marchioness of Santafior.

It was found however that in relating the events of war, it was necessary to speak of real redoubts, which in fact implied things actually redoubtable and formidable, from which cannon were discharged. The word was therefore, in such circumstances, obviously unsuitable to the 'ridotti pacifici,' the pacific redoubts of mere amusement; and the old term assembly was restored, which is indeed the only proper one.

That of rendezvous is occasionally used, but it is more adapted to a small company, and most of all for two individuals.

MESSIAH.

Advertisement.

This article is by M. Polier de Bottens, of an old French family, settled for two hundred years in Switzerland. He is first pastor of Lausanne, and his knowledge is equal to his piety. He composed this article for the great Encyclopædia, in which it was inserted. Only some passages were suppressed, which the examiners thought might be abused by the catholics, less learned and less pious than the author. It was received with applause by all the wise.

Digitized by Google

It was printed at the same time in another small dictionary, and was attributed in France to a man whom there was no reluctance to molest. The article was supposed to be impious, because it was supposed to be by a layman; and the work and its pretended author were violently attacked. The man thus accused contented himself with laughing at the mistake. He beheld with compassion this instance of the errors and injustices which men are every day committing in their judgments; for he had the wise and learned priest's manuscript, written by his own hand. It is still in his possession, and will be shown to whoever shall choose to examine it. In it will be found the very erasures made by this layman himself, to prevent malignant interpretations.

Now then we reprint this article in all the integrity of the original. We have contracted it only to prevent repeating what we have printed elsewhere; but we have not added a single word.

The best of this affair is, that one of the venerable author's brethren wrote the most ridiculous things in the world against this article of his reverend brother's, thinking that he was writing against a common enemy. This is like fighting in the dark, when one is attacked by one's own party.

It has a thousand times happened, that controversialists have condemned passages in St. Augustin and St. Jerome, not knowing that they were by those fathers. They would anathematize a part of the New Testament if they had not heard by whom it was written. Thus it is that men too often judge.

Messiah, 'Messias.' This word comes from the Hebrew, and is synonymous with the Greek word 'Christ.' Both are terms consecrated in religion, which are now no longer given to any but the anointed by eminence—the Sovereign Deliverer whom the ancient Jewish people expected, for whose coming they still sigh, and whom the christians find in the person of Jesus the Son of Mary, whom they consider as the anointed of the Lord, the Messiah promised to hu-

Digitized by Google

manity. The Greeks also use the word 'Elcimmeros,' meaning the same thing with 'Christos.'

In the Old Testament we see that the word Messiah, far from being peculiar to the Deliverer, for whose coming the people of Israel sighed, was not even so to the true and faithful servants of God, but that this name was often given to idolatrous kings and princes, who were, in the hands of the Eternal, the ministers of his vengeance, or instruments for executing the counsels of his wisdom. So the author of Ecclesiasticus says of Elisha,—"Qui ungis reges ad penitentiam;"* or, as it is rendered by the Septuagint, "ad vindictam"—"You anoint kings to execute the vengeance of the Lord." Therefore he sent a prophet to anoint Jehu king of Israel, and announced sacred unction to Hazael, king of Damascus and Syria;† those two princes being the Messiahs of the Most High, to revenge the crimes and abominations of the house of Ahab.

But in the xlv. of Isaiah, verse 1, the name of Messiah is expressly given to Cyrus—"Thus saith the Lord to Cyrus, his anointed, his Messiah, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him," &c.

Ezekiel, in xxviii. of his Revelations, v. 14, gives the name of Messiah to the king of Tyre, whom he also calls Cherubin, and speaks of him and his glory in terms full of an emphasis of which it is easier to feel the beauties than to catch the sense. "Son of man," says the Eternal to the prophet, "take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyre, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God; thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been the Lord's garden of Eden (or, according to other versions, "Thou wast all the Lord's delight"); every precious stone was thy covering; the sardius, topaz, and the diamond; the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper; the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and thy pipes

* Ecclesiast. xlviii. 8.
† 2 Kings, viii. 12, 13, 14.

Digitized by Google

was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou wast a Cherubin, a Messiah, for protection, and I set thee up; thou hast been upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created till iniquity was found in thee."

And the name of Messiah, in Greek Christ, was given to the kings, prophets, and high-priests of the Hebrews. We read, in 1 Kings, chap. xii. 5,—"The Lord is witness against you, and his Messiah is witness;" that is, the king whom he has set up. And elsewhere,—"Touch not my Anointed; do no evil to my prophets. . . ." David, animated by the Spirit of God, repeatedly gives to his father-in-law Saul, whom he had no cause to love—he gives, I say, to this reprobate king, from whom the Spirit of the Eternal was withdrawn, the name and title of Anointed, or Messiah of the Lord. "God preserve me," says he frequently, "from laying my hand upon the Lord's Anointed, upon God's Messiah."

If the fine title of Messiah, or Anointed of the Eternal, was given to idolatrous kings, to cruel and tyrannical princes, it used very often indeed in our ancient oracles to designate the real Anointed of the Lord, the Messiah by eminence; the object of the desire and expectation of all the faithful of Israel. Thus Hannah, the mother of Samuel, concluded her canticle with these remarkable words, which cannot apply to any king, for we know that at that time the Jews had not one:—"The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his Messiah."* We find the same word in the following oracles:—Psalm ii. verse 2; Jeremiah, Lamentations, chap. iv. verse 20; Daniel, chap. ix. verse 25; Habakkuk, chap. iii. verse 13.

If we compare all these different oracles, and in general all those ordinarily applied to the Messiah, there will result contradictions, almost irreconcilable,

* 1 Samuel, ii. 10.

Digitized by Google

justifying to a certain point the obstinacy of the people to whom these oracles were given.

How indeed could these be conceived, before the event had so well justified it in the person of Jesus, son of Mary? How, I say, could there be conceived an intelligence in some sort divine and human together; a being both great and lovely, triumphing over the Devil, yet tempted and carried away by that infernal spirit, that prince of the powers of the air, and made to travel in spite of himself; at once master and servant, king and subject, sacrificer and victim, mortal and immortal, rich and poor, a glorious conqueror, whose reign shall have no end, who is to subdue all nature by prodigies, and yet a man of sorrows, without the conveniences, often without the absolute necessaries of this life, of which he calls himself king; and that he comes, covered with glory and honour, terminating a life of innocence and wretchedness, of incessant crosses and contradictions, by a death alike shameful and cruel, finding in this very humiliation, this extraordinary abasement, the source of an unparalleled elevation, which raises him to the summit of glory, power, and felicity; that is, to the rank of the first of creatures?

All christians agree in finding these characteristics, apparently so incompatible, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they call the 'Christ:' his followers gave him this title by eminence, not that he had been anointed in a sensible and material manner, as some kings, prophets, and sacrificers anciently were, but because the divine spirit had designated him for those great offices, and he had received the spiritual unction necessary thereunto.

* We had proceeded thus far on so competent an article, when a Dutch preacher, more celebrated for this discovery than for the indifferent productions of a genius otherwise feeble and ill-informed, showed to us that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Messiah of God, was anointed at the three grand periods of his life, as our king, our prophet, and our sacrificer.

* The passage from this asterisk to the following one, concerning the Dutch preacher, was suppressed in the Dictionaries, because it was considered extraneous.

Digitized by Google

At the time of his baptism, the voice of the sovereign master of nature declared him to be his son, his only, his well-beloved son, and for that very reason his representative.

When on Mount Tabor he was transfigured and associated with Moses and Elias, the same supernatural voice announces him to humanity as the son of him who loves and who sends the prophets; as him who is to be hearkened to in preference to all others.

In Gethsemané, an angel comes down from heaven to support him in the extreme anguish occasioned by the approach of his torments, and strengthen him against the terrible apprehensions of a death which he cannot avoid, and enable him to become a sacrificer the more excellent, as himself is the pure and innocent victim that he is about to offer.

The judicious Dutch preacher, a disciple of the illustrious Cocceius, finds the sacramental oil of these different celestial unctions in the visible signs which the power of God caused to appear on his anointed; in his baptism, 'the shadow of the dove,' representing the Holy Ghost coming down from him;—on Tabor, the 'miraculous cloud,' which enveloped him;—in Gethsemané, the 'bloody sweat,' which covered his whole body.

After this, it would indeed be the heighth of incredulity not to recognise by these marks the Lord's Anointed by eminence—the promised Messiah; nor doubtless could we sufficiently deplore the inconceivable blindness of the Jewish people, but that it was part of the plan of God's infinite wisdom, and was, in his merciful views, essential to the accomplishment of his work and the salvation of humanity.

But it must also be acknowledged, that in the state of oppression in which the Jewish people were groaning, and after all the glorious promises which the Eternal had so often made them, they must have longed for the coming of a Messiah, and looked towards it as the period of their happy deliverance; and that they are therefore in some sort excusable for not having recognised a deliverer in the person of the Lord Jesus, since it is in man's nature to care more for

Digitized by Google

the body than for the spirit, and to be more sensible to present wants than flattered by advantages 'to come,' and for that very reason, always uncertain.

It must indeed be believed, that Abraham, and after him a very small number of patriarchs and prophets, were capable of forming an idea of the nature of the spiritual reign of the Messiah; but these ideas would necessarily be limited to the narrow circle of the inspired: and it is not astonishing that, being unknown to the multitude, these notions were so far altered that, when the Saviour appeared in Judea, the people, their doctors, and even their princes, expected a monarch—a conqueror—who, by the rapidity of his conquests, was to subdue the whole world. And how could these flattering ideas be reconciled with the abject and apparently miserable condition of Jesus Christ? So, feeling scandalised by his announcing himself as the Messiah, they persecuted him, rejected him, and put him to the most ignominious death. Having since then found nothing tending to the fulfilment of their oracles, and being unwilling to renounce them, they indulge in all sorts of ideas, each one more chimerical than the one preceding.

Thus, when they beheld the triumphs of the christian religion, and found that most of their ancient oracles might be explained spiritually, and applied to Jesus Christ, they thought proper, against the opinion of their fathers, to deny that the passages which we allege against them are to be understood of the Messiah, thus torturing our holy scriptures to their own loss.

Some of them maintain, that their oracles have been misunderstood; that it is in vain to long for the coming of a Messiah, since he has already come in the person of Ezechias. Such was the opinion of the famous Hillel. Others more lax, or politely yielding to times and circumstances, assert, that the belief in the coming of the Messiah is not a fundamental article of faith, and that the denying this dogma either does not injure the integrity of the law, or injures it but slightly. Thus the Jew Albo said to the pope, that

Digitized by Google

"to deny the coming of the Messiah was only to cut off a branch of the tree, without touching the root."

The celebrated rabbi, Solomon Jarchi or Raschi, who lived at the commencement of the twelfth century, says, in his Talmudes, that the ancient Hebrews believed the Messiah to have been born on the day of the last destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies. This is indeed calling in the physician when the man is dead.

The rabbi Kimchi, who also lived in the twelfth century, announced that the Messiah, whose coming he believed to be very near, would drive the christians out of Judea, which was then in their possession; and it is true that the christians lost the Holy Land: but it was Saladin who vanquished them. Had that conqueror but protected the Jews, and declared for them, it is not unlikely that in their enthusiasm they would have made him their Messiah.

Sacred writers, and our Lord Jesus himself, often compare the reign of the Messiah and eternal beatitude to a nuptial festival or a banquet; but the Talmudists have strangely abused these parables: according to them, the Messiah will give to his people, assembled in the land of Canaan, a repast in which the wine will be that which was made by Adam himself in the terrestrial paradise, and which is kept dry, in vast cellars, by the angels at the centre of the earth.

At the first course will be served up the famous fish called the great Leviathan, which swallows up at once a smaller fish, which smaller fish is nevertheless three hundred leagues long: the whole mass of the waters is laid upon Leviathan. In the beginning, God created a male and a female of this fish; but lest they should overturn the land, and fill the world with their kind, God killed the female, and salted her for the Messiah's feast.

The rabbis add, that there will also be killed for this repast the bull Behemoth, which is so large, that he eats each day the hay from a thousand mountains. The female of this bull was killed in the beginning of the world, that so prodigious a species might not mul-

Digitized by Google

tiply, since this could only have injured the other creatures: but they assure us that the Eternal did not salt her, because dried cow is not so good as she-Leviathan. The Jews still put such faith in these rabbinical reveries, that they often swear by their share of the bull Behemoth, as some impious christians swear by their share of paradise.

After such gross ideas of the coming of the Messiah, and of his reign, is it astonishing that the Jews, ancient as well as modern, and also some of the primitive christians unhappily tinctured with all these reveries, could not elevate themselves to the idea of the divine nature of the Lord's Anointed, and did not consider the Messiah as God? Observe how the Jews express themselves on this point in the work entitled 'Judæi Lusitani Quæstiones ad Christianos.'—"To acknowledge a God-man," say they, "is to abuse your own reason, to make to yourself a monster—a centaur—the strange compound of two natures which cannot coalesce."* They add, that the prophets do not teach that the Messiah is God-man; that they expressly distinguish between God and David, declaring the former to be master, the latter servant, &c.

When the Saviour appeared, the prophecies, though clear, were unfortunately obscured by the prejudices imbibed even at the mother's breast. Jesus Christ himself, either from deference towards, or for fear of shocking the public opinion, seems to have been very reserved concerning his divinity. "He wished," says St. Chrysostom, "insensibly to accustom his auditors to the belief of a mystery so far above their reason. If he takes upon him the authority of a God, by pardoning sin, this action raises up against him all who are witnesses of it. His most evident miracles cannot even convince of his divinity those in whose favour they are worked. When, before the tribunal of the sovereign sacrificer, he acknowledges, by a modest intimation, that he is the son of God, the high-priest tears his robe, and cries, Blasphemy! Before the sending

* Quæst. i. ii. iv. xxiii. &c.

Digitized by Google

of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles did not even suspect the divinity of their dear master. He asks them what the people think of him; and they answer, that some take him for Elias, others for Jeremiah, or some other prophet. A particular revelation is necessary to make known to St. Peter, that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God.

The Jews, revolting against the divinity of Christ, have resorted to all sorts of expedients to destroy this great mystery; they distort the meaning of their own oracles, or do not apply them to the Messiah; they assert that the name of God, 'Eloï,' is not peculiar to the Divinity, but is given, even by sacred writers, to judges, to magistrates, and in general to such as are high in authority; they do indeed cite a great many passages of the holy scriptures that justify this observation, but which do not in the least affect the express terms of the ancient oracles concerning the Messiah.

Lastly, they assert, that if the Saviour, and after him the evangelists, the apostles, and the first christians, call Jesus the Son of God, this august term did not in the evangelical times signify anything but the opposite of son of Belial—that is, a good man, a servant of God, in opposition to a wicked man, one without the fear of God.

If the Jews have disputed with Jesus Christ his quality of Messiah and his divinity, they have also used every endeavour to bring him into contempt, by casting on his birth, his life, and his death, all the ridicule and opprobium that their criminal malevolence could imagine.

Of all the works which the blindness of the Jews has produced, there is none more odious and more extravagant than the ancient book entitled "Sepher Toldos Jeschu," brought to light by Wagenseil, in the second volume of his work entitled "Tela Ignea," &c.

In this Sepher Toldos Jeschu we find a monstrous history of the life of our Saviour, forged with the utmost passion and disingenuousness. For instance, they have dared to write, that one Panther, or Pandera, an inhabitant of Bethlehem, fell in love with a young woman married to Jokanam. By this impure commerce he

Digitized by Google

had a son called Jesua or Jesu. The father of this child was obliged to fly, and retired to Babylon. As for young Jesu, he was not sent to the schools; but (adds our author) he had the insolence to raise his head and uncover himself before the sacrificers, instead of appearing before them with his head bent down and his face covered, as was the custom—a piece of effrontery which was warmly rebuked; this caused his birth to be inquired into, which was found to be impure, and soon exposed him to ignominy.

This detestable book, Sepher Toldos Jeschu, was known in the second century: Celsus confidently cites it, and Origen refutes it in his ninth chapter.

There is another book also entitled "Toldos Jeschu," published by Huldric in 1703, which more closely follows the Gospel of the Infancy, but which is full of the grossest anachronisms. It places both the birth and death of Jesus Christ in the reign of Herod the Great, stating that complaints were made of the adultery of Panther and Mary the mother of Jesus, to that prince.

The author, who takes the name of Jonathan, and calls himself a contemporary of Jesus Christ, living at Jerusalem, pretends that Herod consulted, in the affair of Jesus Christ, the senators of a city in the land of Cæsarea. We will not follow so absurd an author through all his contradictions.

Yet it is under cover of all these calumnies that the Jews keep up their implacable hatred against the christians and the gospel. They have done their utmost to alter the chronology of the Old Testament, and to raise doubts and difficulties respecting the time of our Saviour's coming.

Ahmed-ben-Cassum-la-Andacousy, a Moor of Grenada, who lived about the close of the sixteenth century, cites an ancient Arabian manuscript, which was found, together with sixteen plates of lead engraven with Arabian characters, in a grotto near Grenada. Don Pedro y Quinones, archbishop of Grenada, has himself borne testimony to this fact. These leaden plates, called those of Grenada, were afterwards

Digitized by Google

carried to Rome, where, after several years investigation, they were at last condemned as apocryphal, in the pontificate of Alexander VII.; they contain only fabulous stories relating to the lives of Mary and her Son.

The name of Messiah, coupled with the epithet false, is still given to those impostors, who, at various times, have sought to abuse the credulity of the Jewish nation. There were some of these false Messiahs even before the coming of the true Anointed of God. The wise Gamaliel mentions one Theodas,* whose history we read in Josephus's Jewish Antiquities, book xx. chap. 2. He boasted of crossing the Jordan without wetting his feet; he drew many people after him; but the Romans, having fallen upon his little troop, dispersed them, cut off the head of their unfortunate chief, and exposed it in Jerusalem.

Gamaliel also speaks of Judas the Galilean, who is doubtless the same of whom Josephus makes mention in the second chapter of the second book of the Jewish War. He says that this false prophet had gathered together nearly thirty thousand men; but hyperbole is the Jewish historian's characteristic.

In the apostolical times there was Simon, surnamed the magician, who contrived to bewitch the people of Samaria, so that they considered him as 'the great power of God.'†

In the following century, in the years 178 and 179 of the christian era, in the reign of Adrian, appeared the false Messiah Barcochebas, at the head of an army. The emperor sent against them Julius Severus, who, after several encounters, enclosed them in the town of Bither: after an obstinate defence it was carried, and Barcochebas taken and put to death. Adrian thought he could not better prevent the continual revolts of the Jews than by issuing an edict, forbidding them to go to Jerusalem; he also had guards stationed at the

* Acts of the Apostles, v. 34, 35, 36.
† Acts, viii. 9, 10.

Digitized by Google

gates of the city, to prevent the rest of the people of Israel from entering it.

We read in Socrates, an ecclesiastical historian, that in the year 434, there appeared in the island of Candia a false Messiah calling himself Moses. He said he was the ancient deliverer of the Hebrews, raised from the dead to deliver them again.*

A century afterwards, in 530, there was in Palestine a false Messiah named Julian; he announced himself as a great conqueror, who, at the head of his nation, should destroy by arms the whole christian people. Seduced by his promises, the armed Jews butchered many of the christians. The emperor Justinian sent troops against him; battle was given to the false Christ; he was taken, and condemned to the most ignominious death.

At the beginning of the eighth century, Serenus, a Spanish Jew, gave himself out as a Messiah, preached, had some disciples, and, like them, died in misery.

Several false Messiahs arose in the twelfth century. One appeared in France, in the reign of Louis the Young; he and all his adherents were hanged, without its ever being known what was the name of the master or of the disciples.

The thirteenth century was fruitful in false Messiahs; there appeared seven or eight in Arabia, Persia, Spain, and Moravia; one of them, calling himself David el Roy, passed for a very great magician; he reduced the Jews, and was at the head of a considerable party; but this Messiah was assassinated.

James Zeigler of Moravia, who lived in the middle of the sixteenth century, announced the approaching manifestation of the Messiah, born, as he declared, fourteen years before; he had seen him (he said) at Strasburg, and he kept by him with great care a sword and a sceptre, to place them in his hands so soon as he should be old enough to teach.

In the year 1624, another Zeigler confirmed the prediction of the former.

* Socrates, Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 38.

Digitized by Google

In the year 1666, Sabatei Sevi, born at Aleppo, called himself the Messiah foretold by the Zeiglers. He began with preaching on the highways and in the fields, the Turks laughing at him, while his disciples admired him. It appears that he did not gain over the mass of the Jewish nation at first; for the chiefs of the synagogue of Smyrna passed sentence of death against him; but he escaped with the fear only, and with banishment.

He contracted three marriages, of which it is asserted he did not consummate one, saying that it was beneath him so to do. He took into partnership one Nathan Levi, the latter personated the prophet Elias, who was to go before the Messiah. They repaired to Jerusalem, and Nathan there announced Sabatei Sevi as the deliverer of nations. The Jewish populace declared for them, but such as had anything to lose anathematized them.

To avoid the storm, Sevi fled to Constantinople, and from thence to Smyrna, whither Nathan Levi sent to him four ambassadors, who acknowledged and publicly saluted him as the Messiah. This embassy imposed on the people, and also on some of the doctors, who declared Sabetei Sevi to be the Messiah, and king of the Hebrews. But the synagogue of Smyrna condemned its king to be impaled.

Sabatei put himself under the protection of the cadi of Smyrna, and soon had the whole Jewish people on his side; he had two thrones prepared, one for himself, the other for his favourite wife; he took the title of king of kings, and gave to his brother, Joseph Sevi, that of king of Judah. He promised the Jews the certain conquest of the Ottoman empire; and even carried his insolence so far as to have the emperor's name struck out of the Jewish liturgy, and his own substituted.

He was thrown into prison at the Dardanelles; and the Jews gave out that his life was spared only because the Turks well knew he was immortal.

The governor of the Dardanelles grew rich by the presents which the Jews lavished, in order to visit their

Digitized by Google

king, their imprisoned Messiah, who, though in irons, retained all his dignity, and made them kiss his feet.

Meanwhile the sultan, who was holding his court at Adrianople, resolved to put an end to this farce: he sent for Sevi, and told him that if he was the Messiah he must be invulnerable; to which Sevi assented. The Grand Signor then had him placed as a mark for the arrows of his icoglans. The Messiah confessed that he was not invulnerable, and protested that God sent him only to bear testimony to the holy Mussulman religion. Being beaten by the ministers of the law he turned Mahometan; he lived and died equally despised by the Jews and Mussulmans; which cast such discredit on the profession of false Messiah, that Sevi was the last that appeared.*

METAMORPHOSIS.

It may very naturally be supposed, that the metamorphoses with which our earth abounds, suggested the imagination to the orientals, (who have imagined everything,) that the souls of men passed from one body to another. An almost imperceptible point becomes a grub, and that grub becomes a butterfly; an acorn is transformed into an oak; an egg into a bird; water becomes cloud and thunder; wood is changed into fire and ashes; everything, in short, in nature appears to be metamorphosed. What was thus obviously and distinctly perceivable in grosser bodies, was soon conceived to take place with respect to souls, which were considered slight, shadowy, and scarcely material figures. The idea of metempsychosis is perhaps the most ancient dogma of the known world, and prevails still in a great part of India and of China.

It is highly probable again, that the various metamorphoses which we witness in nature, produced those ancient fables which Ovid has collected and embellished in his admirable work. Even the Jews had their

* See the "Essai sur les Mœurs et l'Esprit des Nations," tom. iv. p. 196, where Sevi's history is given more in detail.

Digitized by Google

metamorphoses. If Niobe was changed into a stone, Edith, the wife of Lot, was changed into a statue of salt. If Euridyce remained in hell for having looked behind her, it was for precisely the same indiscretion that this wife of Lot was deprived of her human nature. The village in which Baucis and Philemon resided in Phrygia, is changed into a lake; the same event occurs to Sodom. The daughters of Anius converted water into oil; we have in scripture a metamorphosis very similar, but more true and more sacred. Cadmus was changed into a serpent; the rod of Aaron becomes a serpent also.

The gods frequently change themselves into men; the Jews never saw angels but in the form of men; angels ate with Abraham. Paul, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, says that an angel of Satan has buffetted him: "Angelus Satanæ me colaphizet."

METAPHYSICS.

"TRANS naturam,"—beyond nature. But what is that which is beyond nature? By nature it is to be presumed, is meant matter, and metaphysics relate to that which is not matter.

For example; to your reasoning, which is neither long, nor wide, nor high, nor solid, nor pointed.

Your soul, to yourself unknown, which produces your reasoning.

Spirits, which the world has always talked of, and to which mankind appropriated, for a long period, a body so attenuated and shadowy, that it could scarcely be called body; but from which, at length, they have removed every shadow of body, without knowing what it was that was left.

The manner in which these spirits perceive, without any embarrassment, from the five senses; in which they think, without a head; and in which they communicate their thoughts, without words and signs.

Finally, God, whom we know by his works, but whom our pride impels us to define; God, whose

Digitized by Google

power we feel to be immense; God, between whom and ourselves exists the abyss of infinity, and yet whose nature we dare attempt to fathom.

These are the objects of metaphysics.

We might further add to these the principles of pure mathematics, points without extension, lines without width, superficies without thickness, units infinitely divisible, &c.

Bayle himself considered these objects as those which were denominated "entia rationis," beings of reason; they are however, in fact, only material things considered in their masses, their superficies, their simple lengths and breadths, and the extremities of these simple lengths and breadths. All measures are precise and demonstrated. Metaphysics have nothing to do with geometry.

Thus a man may be a metaphysician without being a geometrician. Metaphysics are more entertaining: they constitute often the romance of the mind. In geometry, on the contrary, we must calculate and measure;-this is a perpetual trouble, and most minds had rather dream pleasantly than fatigue themselves with hard work.

MIND (LIMITS OF THE HUMAN).

Newton was one day asked, why he stepped forward when he was so inclined; and from what cause his arm and his hand obeyed his will? He honestly replied, that he knew nothing about the matter. But at least, said they to him, you who are so well acquainted with the gravitation of planets, will tell us why they turn one way sooner than another? Newton still avowed his ignorance.

Those who teach, that the ocean was salted for fear it should corrupt, and that the tides were created to conduct our ships into port, were a little ashamed when told that the Mediterranean has ports and no tide. Muschembrock himself has fallen into this error.

Who has ever been able to determine precisely how

Digitized by Google

a billet of wood is changed into red hot charcoal, and by what mechanism lime is heated by cold water?

The first motion of the heart in animals—is that accounted for? Has it been exactly discovered how the business of generation is arranged? Has any one divined the cause of sensation, ideas, and memory? We know no more of the essence of matter than the children who touch its superficies.

Who will instruct us in the mechanism by which the grain of corn, which we cast into the earth, disposes itself to produce a stalk surmounted with an ear; or why the sun produces an apple on one tree and a chesnut on the next to it? Many doctors have said, what know I not? Montaigne said, what know I?

Unbending decider! pedagogue in phrases! furred reasoner! thou inquirest after the limits of the human mind:—they are at the end of thy nose.

MIRACLES.

SECTION I.

A MIRACLE, according to the true meaning of the word, is something admirable; and agreeably to this, all is miracle. The stupendous order of nature, the revolution of a hundred millions of worlds round a million of suns, the activity of light, the life of animals, all are grand and perpetual miracles.

According to common acceptation, we call a miracle the violation of these divine and eternal laws. A solar eclipse at the time of the full moon, or a dead man walking two leagues and carrying his head in his arms, we denominate a miracle.

Many natural philosophers maintain, that in this sense there are no miracles; and advance the following arguments.

A miracle is the violation of mathematical, divine, immutable, eternal laws. By the very exposition itself, a miracle is a contradiction in terms: a ' cannot at the same time be immutable and vic'

Digitized by Google

But they are asked, cannot a law, established by God himself, be suspended by its author?

They have the hardihood to reply, that it cannot; and that it is impossible a being infinitely wise can have made laws to violate them. He could not, they say, derange the machine but with a view of making it work better; but it is evident that God, all-wise and omnipotent, originally made this immense machine, the universe, as good and perfect as he was able; if he saw that some imperfections would arise from the nature of matter, he provided for that in the beginning; and, accordingly, he will never change anything in it.

Moreover, God can do nothing without reason; but what reason could induce him to disfigure for a time his own work?

It is done, they are told, in favour of mankind. They reply, we must presume then, that it is in favour of all mankind; for it is impossible to conceive, that the divine nature should occupy itself only about a few men in particular, and not for the whole human race; and even the whole human race itself is a very small concern; it is less than a small ant-hill, in comparison with all the beings inhabiting immensity. But is it not the most absurd of all extravagances to imagine, that the Infinite Supreme should, in favour of three or four hundred emmets on their little heap of earth, derange the operation of the vast machinery that moves the universe?

But admitting that God chose to distinguish a small number of men by particular favours, is there any necessity that, in order to accomplish this object, he should change what he established for all periods and for all places? He certainly can have no need of this inconstancy in order to bestow favours on any of his creatures: his favours consist in his laws themselves: he has foreseen all and arranged all, with a view to them. All invariably obey the force which he has impressed for ever on nature.

For what purpose would God perform a miracle? To accomplish some particular design upon living

Digitized by Google

beings! He would then in reality be supposed to say: I have not been able to effect by my construction of the universe, by my divine decrees, by my eternal laws, a particular object; I am now going to change my eternal ideas and immutable laws, to endeavour to accomplish what I have not been able to do by means of them. This would be an avowal of his weakness, not of his power; it would appear in such a being an inconceivable contradiction. Accordingly, therefore, to dare to ascribe miracles to God is, if man can in reality insult God, actually offering him that insult. It is saying to him,—You are a weak and inconsistent being. It is therefore absurd to believe in miracles; it is in fact dishonouring the divinity.

These philosophers however are not suffered thus to declaim without opposition. You may extol, it is replied, as much as you please, the immutability of the Supreme Being, the eternity of his laws, and the regularity of of his infinitude of worlds; but our little heap of earth has, notwithstanding all that you have advanced, been completely covered over with miracles in every part and time. Histories relate as many prodigies as natural events. The daughters of the high-priest Anius changed whatever they pleased to corn, wine, and oil; Athalide, the daughter of Mercury, revived again several times; Esculapius resuscitated Hippolytus; Hercules rescued Alcestes from the hand of death; and Heres returned to the world after having passed fifteen days in hell. Romulus and Remus were the offspring of a God and a vestal. The Palladium descended from heaven on the city of Troy; the hair of Berenice was changed into a constellation; the cot of Baucis and Philemon was converted into a superb temple; the head of Orpheus delivered oracles after his death; the walls of Thebes spontaneously constructed themselves to the sound of a flute, in the presence of the Greeks; the cures effected in the tem- of Esculapius were absolutely innumerable, and we have monuments still existing containing the very names of persons who were eye-witnesses of his miracles.

Digitized by Google

Mention to me a single nation in which the most incredible prodigies have not been performed, and especially in those periods in which the people scarcely knew how to write or read.

The philosophers make no answer to these objections, but by slightly raising their shoulders and by a smile; but the christian philosophers say: We are believers in the miracles of our holy religion; we believe them by faith and not by our reason, which we are very cautious how we listen to; for when faith speaks, it is well known that reason ought to be silent. We have a firm and entire faith in the miracles of Jesus Christ and the apostles, but permit us to entertain some doubt about many others: permit us, for example, to suspend our judgment on what is related by a very simple man, although he has obtained the title of great. He assures us, that a certain monk was so much in the habit of performing miracles, that the prior at length forbade him to exercise his talent in that line. The monk obeyed; but seeing a poor tiler fall from the top of a house, he hesitated for a moment between the desire to save the unfortunate man's life and the sacred duty of obedience to his superior. He merely ordered the tiler to stay in the air till he should receive further instructions, and ran as fast as his legs would carry him to communicate the urgency of the circumstances to the prior. The prior absolved him from the sin he had committed in beginning the miracle without permission, and gave him leave to finish it, provided he stopped with the same and never again repeated his fault. The philosophers may certainly be excused for entertaining a little doubt of this legend.

But how can you deny, they are asked, that St. Gervais and St. Protais appeared in a dream to St. Ambrose, and informed him of the spot in which were deposited their relics? that St. Ambrose had them disinterred? and that they restored sight to a man that was blind? St. Augustin was at Milan at the very time, and it is he who relates the miracle, using the expression, in the twenty-second book of his work

Digitized by Google

called the 'City of God,'—"immenso populo teste," in the presence of an immense number of people. Here is one of the very best attested and established miracles. The philosophers however say, that they do not believe one word about Gervais and Protais appearing to any person whatever; that it is a matter of very little consequence to mankind where the remains of their carcases lie; that they have no more faith in this blind man than in Vespasian's; that it is a useless miracle, and that God does nothing that is useless; and they adhere to the principles they began with. My respect for St. Gervais and St. Protais prevents me from being of the same opinion as these philosophers: I merely state their incredulity. They lay very great stress on the well-known passage of Lucian, to be found in the death of Peregrinus: "When an expert juggler turns christian, he is sure to make his fortune." But as Lucian is a profane author, we ought surely to set him aside as of no authority.

These philosophers cannot even make up their minds to believe the miracles performed in the second century. Even eye-witnesses to the facts may write and attest to the day of doom, that after the bishop of Smyrna, St. Polycarp, was condemned to be burnt, and actually in the midst of the flames, they heard a voice from heaven exclaiming—"Courage, Polycarp, be strong, and show yourself a man;" that at the very instant, the flames quitted his body, and formed a pavilion of fire above his head, and from the midst of the pile there flew out a dove; when at length Polycarp's enemies ended his life by cutting off his head. All these facts and attestations are in vain. For what good, say these unimpressible and incredulous men, for what good was this miracle? Why did the flames lose their nature, and the axe of the executioner retain all its power of destruction? Whence comes it that so many martyrs escaped unhurt out of boiling oil, but were unable to resist the edge of the sword? It is answered, such was the will of God. But the philosophers would wish to see and hear all this themselves, before they believe it.

Digitized by Google

Those who strengthen their reasonings by learning, will tell you, that the fathers of the church have frequently declared, that miracles were in their days performed no longer. St. Chrysostom says expressly—"The extraordinary gifts of the spirit were bestowed even on the unworthy, because the church at that time had need of miracles; but now they are not bestowed even on the worthy, because the church has need of them no longer." He afterwards declares, that there is no one now who raises the dead, or even who heals the sick.

St. Augustin himself, notwithstanding the miracles of Gervais and Protais, says, in his 'City of God,' "Why are not such miracles as were wrought formerly wrought now?" and he assigns the same reason as St. Chrysostom for it.

"Cur, inquiunt, nunc illa miracula quæ prædicatis facta esse non fiunt? Possem quidem dicere necessaria prius fuisse, quàm crederet mundus, ad hoc ut crederet mundus."

It is objected to the philosophers, that St. Augustin, notwithstanding this avowal, mentions nevertheless an old cobler of Hippo, who, having lost his garment, went to pray in the chapel of the twenty martyrs, and on his return found a fish, in the body of which was a gold ring; and that the cook who dressed the fish, said to the cobler,—"See what a present the twenty martyrs have made you!"

To this the philosophers reply, that there is nothing in the event here related in opposition to the laws of nature; that natural philosophy is not contradicted or shocked by a fish's swallowing a gold ring, or a cook's delivering such ring to a cobler; that in short there is no miracle at all in the case.

If these philosophers are reminded that, according to St. Jerome, in his Life of Paul the Hermit, that hermit had many conversations with satyrs and fauns; that a raven carried to him every day, for thirty years together, half of a loaf for his dinner, and a whole one on the day that St. Anthony went to visit him, they might reply again, that all this is not absolutely incon-

Digitized by Google

sitent with natural philosophy; that satyrs and fauns may have existed; and that, at all events, whether the narrative be a recital of facts, or only a story fit for children, it has nothing at all to do with the miracles of our Lord and his apostles. Many good christians have contested the history of St. Simeon Stylites, written by Theodoret; many miracles considered authentic by the Greek church have been called in question by many Latins, just as the Latin miracles have been suspected by the Greek church. Afterwards, the protestants appeared on the stage, and treated the miracles of both churches certainly with very little respect or ceremony.

A learned jesuit,* who was long a preacher in the Indies, deplores that neither his colleagues nor himself could ever perform a miracle. Xavier laments, in many of his letters, that he has not the gift of languages. He says, that among the Japanese he is merely like a dumb statue: yet the jesuits have written, that he resuscitated eight persons. That was certainly no trifling matter; but it must be recollected that he resuscitated them six thousand leagues distant. Persons have been since found, who have pretended that the abolition of the jesuits in France is a much greater miracle than any performed by Xavier and Ignatius.

However that may be, all christians agree that the miracles of Jesus Christ and the apostles are incontestably true; but that we may certainly be permitted to doubt some stated to have been performed in our own times, and which have not been completely authenticated.

It would certainly, for example, be very desirable, in order to the firm and clear establishment of a miracle, that it should be performed in the presence of the Academy of Sciences of Paris, or the Royal Society of London, and the Faculty of Medicine, assisted by a detachment of guards to keep in due order and distance the populace, who might by their rudeness or indiscretion prevent the operation of the miracle.

---

* Ospinian, p. 230.

Digitized by Google

A philosopher was once asked what he should say if he saw the sun stand still, that is, if the motion of the earth round that star were to cease; if all the dead were to rise again; and if the mountains were to go and throw themselves together into the sea, all in order to prove some important truth, like that, for instance, of versatile grace? What should I say? answered the philosopher—I should become a Manichean; I should say that one principle counteracted the performance of another.

SECTION II.

Define your terms, you will permit me again to say, or we shall never understand one another. "Miraculum, res miranda, prodigium, portentum, monstrum." Miracle, something admirable; prodigy, implying something astonishing; portentous, bearing with it novelty; monster, something to show (à montrer) on account of its variety.

Such are the first ideas that men formed of miracles.

As everything is refined and improved upon, such also would be the case with this definition. A miracle is said to be that which is impossible to nature. But it was not considered that this was in fact saying all miracle is absolutely impossible. For what is nature? You understand by it the eternal order of things. A miracle would therefore be impossible in such an order. In this sense God could not work a miracle.

If you mean by miracle an effect of which you cannot perceive the cause, in that sense all is miracle. The attraction and direction of the magnet are continual miracles. A snail whose head is renewed is a miracle. The birth of every animal, the production of every vegetable, are miracles of every day.

But we are so accustomed to these prodigies, that they have lost their name of admirable—of miraculous. The Indians are no longer astonished by cannon.

We have therefore formed for ourselves another idea of a miracle. It is, according to the common opinion, what never has happened and never will happen. Such is the idea formed of Samson's jawbone of an ass; of

Digitized by Google

the conversation between the ass and Balaam, and that between a serpent and Eve; of the chariot with four horses that conveyed away Elijah; of the fish that kept Jonah in its belly seventy-two hours; of the ten plagues of Egypt, of the walls of Jericho, and of the sun and moon standing still at mid-day, &c. &c. &c.

In order to believe a miracle, it is not enough merely to have seen it; for a man may be deceived. A fool is often called a dealer in wonders; and not merely do many excellent persons think that they have seen what they have not seen, and heard what was never said to them,—not only do they thus become witnesses of miracles, but they become also subjects of miracles. They have been sometimes diseased, and sometimes cured by supernatural power; they have been changed into wolves; they have travelled through the air on broomsticks; they have become both incubi and succubi.

It is necessary that the miracle should have been seen by a great number of very sensible people, in sound health, and perfectly disinterested in the affair. It is above all necessary, that it should have been solemnly attested by them; for if solemn forms of authentication are deemed necessary with respect to transactions of a very simple character, such as the purchase of a house, a marriage contract, or a will, what particular and minute cautionary formalities must not be deemed requisite in order to verify things naturally impossible, on which the destiny of the world is to depend?

Even when an authentic miracle is performed, it in fact proves nothing; for scripture tells you, in a great variety of places, that impostors may perform miracles, and that if any man, after having performed them, should proclaim another God than that of the Jews, he ought to be stoned to death.

It is requisite therefore, that the doctrine should be confirmed by the miracles, and the miracles by the doctrine.

Even this however is not sufficient. As impostors may preach a very correct and pure morality, the better to deceive, and it is admitted that impostors, like the

Digitized by Google

magicians of Pharaoh, may perform miracles; it is in addition necessary, that these miracles should have been announced by prophecies.

In order to be convinced of the truth of these prophecies, it is necessary that they should have been heard clearly announced, and seen really accomplished.* It is necessary to possess perfectly the language in which they are preserved.

It is not sufficient even, that you are a witness of their miraculous fulfilment; for you may be deceived by false appearances. It is necessary that the miracle and prophecy should be verified on oath by the heads of the nation; and even after all this there will be some doubters. For it is possible for a nation to be interested in the forgery of a prophecy or a miracle; and when interest mixes with the transaction, you may consider the whole affair as worth nothing. If a predicted miracle be not as public and as well verified as an eclipse that is announced in the almanac, be assured that it is nothing better than a juggler's trick or an old woman's tale.

SECTION III.

A theocracy can be founded only upon miracles. Everything in it must be divine. The great sovereign speaks to men only in prodigies. These are his ministers and letters patent. His orders are intimated by ocean covering the earth to drown the nations, or opening a way through its depths, that they may pass upon dry land.

Accordingly you perceive, that in the Jewish history all is miracle; from the creation of Adam and the formation of Eve, who was made of one of the ribs of Adam, to the time of the insignificant kingling Saul.

Even in the time of this same Saul theocracy participates in power with royalty. There are still, consequently, miracles performed from time to time; but there is no longer that splendid train of prodigies which continually astonishes and interrupts nature. The

* See the article PROPHECY.

Digitized by Google

ten plagues of Egypt are not renewed; the sun and moon do not stand still at mid-day, in order to give a captain commander time to exterminare a few runaways, already nearly destroyed by a shower of stones from the clouds. No Samson again extirpates a thousand Philistines by the jaw-bone of an ass. Asses no longer talk rationally with men; walls no longer fall prostrate at the mere sound of trumpets; cities are not swallowed up in a lake by the fire of heaven; the race of man is not a second time destroyed by a deluge. But the finger of God is still manifested; the shade of Saul is permitted to appear at the invocation of the sorceress, and God himself promises David that he will defeat the Philistines at Baal-perazim.

"God gathers together his celestial army in the reign of Ahab, and asks the spirits,—*Who will go and deceive Ahab, and persuade him to go up to war against Ramoth Gilead? And there come forth a lying spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will persuade him." But the prophet Micaiah alone heard this conversation, and he received a blow on the cheek from another prophet, called Zedekiah, for having announced the ill-omened prodigy.

Of miracles performed in the sight of the whole nation, and changing the laws of all nature, we see no more until the time of Elijah, for whom the Lord dispatched a chariot of fire and horses of fire, which conveyed him rapidly from the banks of the Jordan to heaven, although no one knew where heaven was.

From the commencement of historical times, that is, from the time of the conquests of Alexander, we see no more miracles among the Jews.

When Pompey comes to make himself master of Jerusalem—when Crassus plunders the temple—when Pompey puts to death the king of the Jews by the hands of the executioner—when Anthony confers the kingdom of Judea on the Arabian Herod—when Titus takes Jerusalem by assault, and when it is rased to the ground by Adrian—not a single miracle is ever performed.

* 1 Kings, xxii.

Thus it is with every nation upon earth. They begin with theocracy; they end in a manner simply and naturally human. The farther the progress made in society and knowledge, the fewer there are of prodigies.

We well know that the theocracy of the Jews was the only true one, and that those of other nations were false; but in all other respects, the case was precisely the same with them as with the Jews.

In Egypt, in the time of Vulcan, and in that of Isis and Osiris, everything was out of the laws of nature; under the Ptolemies everything resumed its natural course.

In the remote periods of Phos, Chrysos, and Ephestes, gods and mortals conversed in Chaldea with the most interesting familiarity. A god warned king Xissuter, that there would be a deluge in Armenia, and that it was necessary he should, as soon as possible, build a vessel five stadii in length and two in width. Such things do not happen to the Dariuses and the Alexanders.

The fish Oannes, in former times, came every day out of the Euphrates to preach upon its banks: but there is no preaching fish now. It is true that St. Anthony of Padua went and preached to the fishes; however, such things happen so very rarely, that they are scarcely to be taken any account of.

Numa held long conversations with the nymph Egeria; but we never read that Cæsar had any with Venus, although he was descended from her in the direct line. The world, we see, is constantly advancing a little, and refining gradually.

But after being extricated out of one slough for a time, mankind are soon plunged into another. To ages of civilisation succeed ages of barbarism; that barbarism is again expelled, and again re-appears: it is the regular alternation of day and night.

Of those who have been so impiously rash as to deny the Miracles of Jesus Christ.

Among the moderns, Thomas Woolston, a learned member of the university of Cambridge, appears to me

Digitized by Google

to have been the first who ventured to interpret the gospels merely in a typical, allegorical, and spiritual sense, and boldly maintained that not one of the miracles of Jesus was actually performed. He wrote without method or art, and in a style confused and coarse, but not destitute of vigour. His six discourses against the miracles of Jesus Christ were publicly sold at London, in his own house. In the course of two years, from 1737 to 1739, he had three editions of them printed, of twenty thousand copies each, and yet it is now very difficult to procure one from the booksellers.

Never was christianity so daringly assailed by any christian. Few writers entertain less awe or respect for the public, and no priest ever declared himself more openly the enemy of priests. He even dared to justify this hatred by that of Jesus Christ against the Pharisees and Scribes; and he said that he should not, like Jesus Christ, become their victim, because he had come into the world in a more enlightened age.

He certainly hoped to justify his rashness by his adoption of the mystical sense; but he employs expressions so contemptuous and abusive that every christian ear is shocked at them.

If we may believe him,* when Jesus sent the Devil into the herd of two thousand swine, he did neither more nor less than commit a robbery on their owners. If the story had been told of Mahomet, he would have been considered as "an abominable wizard, and a sworn slave to the Devil." And if the proprietor of the swine, and the merchants who in the outer court of the temple sold beasts for sacrifices,† and whom Jesus drove out with a scourge, came to demand justice when he was apprehended, it is clear that he was deservedly condemned, as there never was a jury in England that would not have found him guilty.

He tells her fortune to the woman of Samaria, just like a wandering Bohemian or gipsy.‡ This alone was sufficient to cause his banishment, which was the punishment inflicted upon fortune-tellers, or diviners,

* Vol. i. 38. † Page 39. ‡ Page 52.

Digitized by Google

by Tiberius. "I am astonished," says he, "that the gipsies do not proclaim themselves the genuine disciples of Jesus, as their vocation is the same. However, I am glad to see that he did not extort money from the Samaritan woman, differing in this respect from our clergy, who take care to be well paid for their divinations."*

I follow the order of the pages in his book. The author goes on to the entrance of Jesus Christ into Jerusalem. It is not clear, he says,† whether he was mounted on a male or female ass, or upon the foal of an ass, or upon all three together.

He compares Jesus, when tempted by the Devil, to St. Dunstan, who seized the Devil by the nose; and he gives the preference to St. Dunstan.

At the article of the fig-tree, which was cursed with barrenness for not producing figs out of season for them, he describes Jesus as a mere vagabond,‡ a mendicant friar, who before he turned field-preacher was "no better than a journeyman carpenter." It is surprising, he says, that the court of Rome has not among all its relics some little fancy-box or joint-stool of his workmanship. In a word, it is difficult to carry blasphemy farther.

After diverting himself with the probationary fish-pool of Bethesda, the waters of which were troubled or stirred once in every year by an angel, he enquires how it could well be, that neither Flavius Josephus nor Philo should ever mention this angel; why St. John should be the sole historian of this miracle; and by what other miracle it happened that no Roman ever saw this angel,§ or ever even heard his name mentioned?

The water changed into wine at the marriage in Cana, according to him, excites the laughter and contempt of all who are not imbruted by superstition.

"What!" says he,‖ "John expressly says that the guests were already intoxicated, 'methus tosi;' and

* Vol. i. 55.
† Page 65.
‡ Third Discourse, p. 8.
§ Vol. i. 60.
‖ Fourth Discourse, p. 31.

Digitized by Google

God comes down to earth and performs his first miracle to enable them to drink still more!"

God made man, commences his mission by assisting at a village wedding. "Whether Jesus and his mother were drunk, as were others of the company, is not certain.* The familiarity of the lady with a soldier leads to the presumption that she was fond of her bottle; that her son however was somewhat affected by the wine, appears from his answering his mother so 'waspishly and snappishly' as he did, when he said, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" It may be inferred, from these words, that Mary was not a virgin, and that Jesus was not her son; had it been otherwise, he would not have thus insulted his father and mother in violation of one of the most sacred commandments of the law. However, he complies with his mother's request; he fills eighteen jars with water, and makes punch of it." These are the very words of Thomas Woolston, and must fill every christian soul with indignation.

It is with regret, and even with trembling, that I quote these passages; but there have been sixty thousand copies of this work printed, all bearing the name of the author, and all publicly sold at his house. It can never be said that I calumniate him.

It is to the dead raised again by Jesus Christ that he principally directs his attention. He contends that a dead man restored to life would have been an object of attention and astonishment to the universe; that all the Jewish magistracy, and more especially Pilate, would have made the most minute investigations and obtained the most authentic depositions; that Tiberius enjoined all proconsuls, prætors, and governors of provinces to inform him with exactness of every event that took place; that Lazarus, who had been dead four whole days, would have been most strictly interrogated; and that no little curiosity would have been excited to know what had become, during that time, of his soul.

With what eager interest would Tiberius and the

* Page 32.

Digitized by Google

whole Roman senate have questioned him, and not indeed only him, but the daughter of Jairus and the son of the widow of Naim? Three dead persons restored to life would have been three attestations to the divinity of Jesus, which almost in a single moment would have made the whole world christian. But instead of all this, the whole world, for more than two hundred years, knew nothing about these resplendent and decisive evidences. It is not till a hundred years have rolled away from the date of the events, that some obscure individuals show one another the writings that contain the relation of those miracles. Eighty-nine emperors, reckoning those who had only the name of 'tyrants,' never hear the slightest mention of these resurrections, although they must inevitably have held all nature in amazement. Neither the Jewish historian Josephus, nor the learned Philo, nor any Greek or Roman historian at all notices these prodigies. In short, Woolston has the imprudence to say, that the history of Lazarus is so brimful of absurdities that St. John, when he wrote it, had outlived his senses.*

Supposing, says Woolston,† that God should in our own times send an ambassador to London to convert the hireling clergy, and that ambassador should raise the dead, what would the clergy say?

He blasphemes the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension of Jesus Christ, just upon the same system;‡ and he calls these miracles—"The most manifest and the most barefaced imposture that ever was put upon the world!"

What is perhaps more singular still is, that each of his discourses is dedicated to a bishop. His dedications are certainly not exactly in the French style. He bestows no flattery or compliments. He upbraids them with their pride and avarice, their ambition and faction, and smiles with triumph at the thought of their being now, like every other class of citizens, in complete subjection to the laws of the state.

At last these bishops, tired of being insulted by an

* Vol. ii. 33. † Vol. ii. 47. ‡ Vol. ii. Discourse vi. 27.

Digitized by Google

undignified member of the university of Cambridge determined upon a formal appeal to the laws. They instituted a prosecution against Woolston in the King's Bench, and he was tried before Chief-Justice Raymond, in 1729, when he was imprisoned, condemned to pay a fine, and obliged to give security to the amount of a hundred and fifty pounds sterling. His friends furnished him with the security, and he did not in fact die in prison, as in some of our careless and ill-compiled dictionaries he is stated to have done. He died at his own house in London, after having uttered these words—"This is a pass that every man must come to." Some time before his death, a female zealot meeting him in the street was gross enough to spit in his face; he calmly wiped his face and bowed to her. His manners were mild and pleasing. He was obstinately infatuated with the mystical meaning, and blasphemed the literal one; but let us hope that he repented on his death-bed, and that God has showed him mercy.

About the same period there appeared in France the will of John Meslier, clergyman (curé) of But and Entrepigni, in Champagne, of whom we have already spoken, under the article CONTRADICTIONS.

It was both a wonderful and a melancholy spectacle to see two priests at the same time writing against the christian religion. Meslier is still more violent than Woolston. He ventures to treat the Devil's carrying off our Lord to the top of a mountain, the marriage of Cana, and the loaves and fishes, as absurd tales, injurious to the Supreme Being, which for three hundred years were unknown to the whole Roman empire, and at last advanced from the dregs of the community to the throne of the emperors, when policy compelled them to adopt the nonsense of the people, in order to keep them the better in subjection. The declamations of the English priest do not approach in vehemence those of the priest of Champagne. Woolston occasionally showed discretion. Meslier never has any; he is a man so sensitively sore to the crimes he has been witness to, that he renders the christian religion responsible for them, forgetting that it condemns them.

Digitized by Google

There is not a single miracle which is not with him an object of scorn or horror; no prophecy which he does not compare with the prophecies of Nostradamus. He even goes so far as to compare Jesus Christ to Don Quixote, and St. Peter to Sancho Panza; and what is most of all to be deplored is, that he wrote these blasphemies against Jesus Christ when he might be said to be in the very arms of death,—at a moment when the most deceitful are sincere, and the most intrepid tremble. Too strongly impressed by some injuries that had been done him by his superiors in authority; too deeply affected by the great difficulties which he met with in the scripture, he became exasperated against it more than Acosta and all the Jews,—more than Porphyry, Celsus, Iamblichus, Julian, Libanius, Maximus, Simmachus, or any other whatever of the partisans of human reason against the divine incomprehensibilities of our religion. Many abridgments of his work have been printed; but happily the persons in authority suppressed them as fast as they appeared.

A priest of Bonne-Nouvelle, near Paris, wrote also on the same subject; and it thus happened that, at the very time the abbé Becheran and the rest of the convulsionaries were performing miracles, three priests were writing against the genuine gospel miracles.

The most clever work that has been written against the miracles and prophecies, is that of my lord Bolingbroke.* But happily it is so voluminous, so destitute of method, so verbose, and so abounding in long and sometimes complicated sentences, that it requires a great deal of patience to read him.

There have been some minds so constituted, that they have been enchanted by the miracles of Moses and Joshua, but have not entertained for those of Jesus Christ the respect to which they are entitled. Their imagination,—raised by the grand spectacle of the sea opening a passage through its depths, and suspending its waves that a horde of Hebrews might safely go through—by the ten plagues of Egypt, and by

* In six volumes.

Digitized by Google

the stars that stopped in their course over Gibeon and Ajalon, &c.—could not with ease and satisfaction be let down again, so as to admire the comparatively petty miracles of the water changed into wine, the withered fig-tree, and the swine drowned in the little lake at Gadara.

Vaghenseil said that it was like hearing a rustic ditty after attending to a grand concert.

The Talmud pretends that there have been many christians who, after comparing the miracles of the Old Testament with those of the New, embraced Judaism; they considered it impossible that the Sovereign Lord of Nature should have wrought such stupendous prodigies for a religion he intended to annihilate. What! they exclaimed, can it possibly be, that for a series of ages he should have exhibited a train of astonishing and tremendous miracles in favour of a true religion that was to become a false one? What! can it be, that God himself has recorded that this religion shall never perish, and that those who attempt to destroy it shall be stoned to death, and yet that he has nevertheless sent his own Son, who is no other than himself, to annihilate what he was employed so many ages in erecting!

There is much more to be added to these remarks; this Son, they continue, this Eternal God, having made himself a Jew, adheres to the Jewish religion during the whole of his life; he performs all the functions of it, he frequents the Jewish temple, he announces nothing contrary to the Jewish law, and all his disciples are Jews and observe the Jewish ceremonies. It most certainly is not he who established the christian religion. It was established by the dissident Jews who united with the Platonists. There is not a single dogma of christianity that was preached by Jesus Christ.

Such is the reasoning of these rash men, who, with minds at once hypocritical and audacious, dare to criticise the works of God, and admit the miracles of the Old Testament for the sole purpose of rejecting those of the New.

Digitized by Google

Of this number was the unfortunate priest of Pont-à-Mousson in Lorraine, called Nicholas Anthony; he was known by no other name. After he had received what is called 'the four minors' in Lorraine, the Calvinistic preacher Ferri, happening to go to Pont-à-Mousson, raised in his mind very serious scruples, and persuaded him that the four minors were the mark of the beast. Anthony, driven almost to distraction at the thought of carrying about him the mark of the beast, had it immediately effaced by Ferri, embraced the protestant religion, and became a minister at Geneva about the year 1630.

With a head full of rabbinical learning, he thought that if the protestants were right in reference to the papists, the Jews were much more so in reference to all the different sects of christianity whatever. From the village of Divonne, where he was pastor, he went to be received as a Jew at Venice, together with a young apprentice in theology whom he had persuaded to adopt his own principles, but who afterwards abandoned him, not experiencing any call to martyrdom.

At first the minister, Nicholas Anthony, abstained from uttering the name of Jesus Christ in his sermons and prayers; in a short time however, becoming animated and emboldened by the example of the Jewish saints, who confidently professed judaism before the princes of Tyre and Babylon, he travelled bare-footed to Geneva, to confess before the judges and magistrates that there is only one religion upon earth, because there is only one God; that that religion is the Jewish; that it is absolutely necessary to become circumcised; and that it is a horrible crime to eat bacon and blood pudding. He pathetically exhorted all the people of Geneva, who crowded to hear him, no longer to continue children of Belial, but to become good Jews, in order to deserve the kingdom of heaven. He was apprehended, and put in chains.

The little council of Geneva, which at that period did nothing without consulting the council of preachers, asked their advice in this emergency. The most sensible of them recommended that poor Anthony should

Digitized by Google

be bled in the cephalic vein, use the bath, and be kept upon gruel and broths; after which he might perhaps gradually be induced to pronounce the name of Jesus Christ, or at least to hear it pronounced, without grinding his teeth, as had hitherto been his practice. They added, that the laws bore with Jews; that there were eight thousand of them even in Rome itself; that many merchants are true Jews, and therefore that as Rome admitted within its walls eight thousand children of the synagogue, Geneva might well tolerate one. At the sound of 'toleration' the rest of the pastors, who were the majority, gnashing their teeth still more than Anthony did at the name of Jesus Christ, and also eager to find an opportunity to burn a man, which could not be done every day, called peremptorily for the burning. They resolved, that nothing could serve more to establish genuine christianity; that the Spaniards had obtained so much reputation in the world only by burning the Jews every year, and that after all, if the Old Testament must prevail over the New, God would not fail to come and extinguish the flames of the pile, as he did at Babylon for Sharach, Meshac, and Abednego; in which case all must go back again to the Old Testament; but that, in the mean time, it was it was indispensible to burn Nicholas Anthony. On the breaking up of the meeting, they concluded with the observation, "We must put the wicked out of the way:"—the very words they used.

The long-headed syndics Sarasin and Godefroi agreed that the reasoning of the calvinistic sanhedrim was admirable, and by the right of the strongest party, condemned Nicholas Anthony, the weakest of men to die the same death as Calanus and the counsellor Dubourg. This sentence was carried into execution on the twentieth of April, in 1632, in a very beautiful lawn or meadow, called Plain-Palais, in the presence of twenty thousand persons, who blessed the new law, and the wonderful sense of the syndics Sarasin and Godefroi.

The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, did not

Digitized by Google

renew the miracle of the furnace of Babylon in favour of poor Anthony.

Abauzit, an author of great veracity, relates in his notes, that he died in the greatest constancy, and persisted in his opinions even at the stake on the pile: he broke out into no passionate invective against his judges when the executioner was tying him to the stake; he displayed neither pride nor pusillanimity; he neither wept nor sighed: he was resigned. Never did martyr consummate his sacrifice with a more lively faith; never did philosopher contemplate a death of horror with greater firmness. This clearly proves that his folly or madness was at all events attended with sincere conviction. Let us implore of the God both of the Old and New Testament that he will grant him mercy.

I would say as much for the jesuit Malagrida, who was still more infatuated and mad than Nicholas Anthony; as I would also for the ex-jesuits Patouillet and Paulian, should they ever be brought to the stake.

A great number of writers, whose misfortune it was to be philosophers rather than christians, have been bold enough to deny the miracles of our Lord; but after the four priests already noticed, there is no necessity to enumerate other instances. Let us lament over these four unfortunate men, led astray by their own deceitful reason, and precipitated by the gloom of their feelings into an abyss so dreadful and so fatal.

MISSION.

It is far from our object in this article to reflect upon the zeal of our missionaries, or the truth of our religion; these are sufficiently known in christian Europe, and duly respected.

My object is merely to make some remarks on the very curious and edifying letters of the reverend fathers, the jesuits, who are not equally respectable. Scarcely do they arrive in India before they commence preaching, convert millions of Indians, and perform

Digitized by Google

millions of miracles. Far be it from me to contradict their assertions. We all know how easy it must be to a Biscayan, a Bergamasque, or a Norman, to learn the Indian language in a few days, and preach like an Indian.

With regard to miracles, nothing is more easy than to perform them at a distance of six thousand leagues, since so many have been performed at Paris, in the parish of St. Medard. The sufficing grace of the Molinists could undoubtedly operate on the banks of the Ganges, as well as the efficacious grace of the Jansenists on those of the river of the Gobelins. We have however said so much already about miracles, that we shall pursue the subject no farther.

A reverend father jesuit arrived in the course of the past year at Delhi, at the court of the Great Mogul. He was not a man profoundly skilled in mathematics, or highly gifted in mind, who had come to correct the calendar, or to establish his fortune, but one of those poor honest zealous jesuits, one of those soldiers who are despatched on particular duty by their general, and who obey orders without reasoning about them.

M. Andrais, my factor, asked him what his business might be at Delhi. He replied, that he had orders from the reverend father Ricci to deliver the Great Mogul from the paws of the devil, and convert his whole court. I have already, he said, baptised twenty infants in the street, without their knowing anything at all about the matter, by throwing a few drops of water upon their heads. They are now just so many angels, provided they are happy enough to die directly. I cured a poor old woman of the megrims by making the sign of the cross behind her. I hope in a short time to convert the Mahometans of the court and the Gentoos among the people. You will see in Delhi, Agra, and Benares, as many good catholics, adorers of the Virgin Mary, as you now do idolaters, adoring the devil.

M. ANDRAIS.

You think then, my worthy father, that the inhabitants of these countries adore idols and the devil?

Digitized by Google

THE JESUIT.

Undoubtedly, as they are not of my religion.

M. ANDRAIS.

Very well. But when there are as many catholics in India as idolators, are you not afraid that they will fight against one another; that blood will flow for a long period, and the whole country be a scene of pillage and devastation? This has happened in every country in which you have obtained a footing hitherto.

THE JESUIT.

You make one pause for a moment; but nothing could happen better than that which you suggest as being so probable. The slaughtered catholics would go to paradise (to the garden), and the Gentoos to the everlasting fire of hell created for them from all eternity, according to the great mercy of God, and for his great glory; for God is exceedingly glorious.

M. ANDRAIS.

But suppose that you should be informed against, and punished at the whipping-post?

THE JESUIT.

That also would be for his glory. However, I conjure you to keep my secret, and save me from the honour and happiness of martyrdom.

MONEY,

A WORD made use of to express gold. Sir, will you lend me a hundred louis-d'ors?—Sir, I would with all my heart, but I have no money; I am out of ready money. The Italian will say to you: 'Signore, non ha di danari,' I have no deniers.

Harpagon asks Maître Jacques, Wilt thou make a good entertainment?—Yes, if you will give me plenty of money.

We continually enquire, which of the countries of Europe is the richest in money? By that we mean, which is the people who circulate the most metals representative of objects of commerce? In the same manner we ask, which is the poorest? and thirty contending nations present themselves—the Westphalian, Limosin, Basque, Tyrolese, Valois, Grison, Istrian,

Scotch, and Irish, the Swiss of a small canton, and above all the subjects of the pope.

In deciding which has most, we hesitate at present between France, Spain, and Holland, which had none in 1600.

Formerly, in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, the province of the papal treasury had no doubt the most ready money, and therefore the greatest trade. How do you sell that? would be asked of a theological merchant, who replied, For as much as the people are fools enough to give me.

All Europe then sent its money to the Roman court, who gave in change consecrated beads, agnuses, indulgences plenary and limited, dispensations, confirmations, exemptions, benedictions, and even excommunications against those whom the subscribers chose, and who had not sufficient faith in the court of Rome.

The Venetians sold nothing of all this, but they traded with all the west by Alexandria, and it was through themonly that we had pepper and cinnamon. The money which went not to the papal treasury came to them, excepting a little to the Tuscans and Genoese. All the other kingdoms of Europe were so poor in ready money, that Charles VIII. was obliged to borrow the jewels of the duchess of Savoy and put them in pawn, to raise funds to conquer Naples, which he soon lost again. The Venetians supported stronger armies than his. A noble Venetian had more gold in his coffers, and more vessels of silver on his table, than the emperor Maximilian surnamed 'Pochi danari.'

Things changed when the Portuguese traded with India as conquerors, and the Spaniards subjugated Mexico and Peru with six or seven hundred men. We know that then the commerce of Venice, and the other towns of Italy all fell to the ground. Philip II. the master of Spain, Portugal, the Low Countries, the Two Sicilies, and the Milanese, of fifteen hundred leagues of coasts in Asia, and mines of gold and silver in America, was the only rich, and consequently the only powerful prince in Europe. The spies whom he gained in France kissed on their knees the catholic

Digitized by Google

doubloons, and the small number of angels and carolusses which circulated in that country had not much credit. It is pretended, that America and Asia brought him in nearly ten million ducats of revenue. He would have really bought Europe with his money, but for the iron of Henry IV. and the fleets of queen Elizabeth.

The Dictionnaire Encyclopedique, in the article 'Argent,' quotes the Spirit of Laws, in which it is said, "I have heard deplored, a thousand times, the blindness of the council of Francis I. who rejected the proposal of Christopher Columbus for the discovery of the Indies:—perhaps this imprudence has turned out a very wise thing."

We see by the enormous power of Philip, that the pretended council of Francis I. could not have done such a wise thing. But let us content ourselves with remarking, that Francis I. was not born when it is pretended that he refused the offers of Christopher Columbus. The Genoese captain landed in America in 1492, and Francis I. was born in 1497, and ascended not the throne until 1515. Let us here compare the revenues of Henry III. Henry IV. and queen Elizabeth, with those of Philip II. The ordinary income of Elizabeth was only one hundred thousand pounds sterling, and with extras it was, one year with another, four hundred thousand; but she required this surplus to defend herself from Philip II. Without extreme economy she would have been lost, and England with her.

The revenue of Henry III. indeed increased to thirty millions of livres of his time; this, to the sum that Philip drew from the Indies, was as three to ten; but not more than a third of this money entered into the coffers of Henry III. who was very prodigal, greatly robbed, and consequently very poor. We find that Philip II. in one article was ten times richer than Henry.

As to Henry IV. it is not worth while to compare his treasures with those of Philip II. Until the peace of Vervins, he had only what he could borrow or win

Digitized by Google

at the point of his sword; and he lived as a knight-errant, until the time in which he became the first king in Europe.

England had always been so poor, that king Edward III. was the first king who coined money of gold.

Would we know what became of the money which flowed continually from Mexico and Peru into Spain? It entered the pockets of the French, English, and Dutch who traded with Cadiz under Spanish names; and who sent to America the productions of their manufactories. A great part of this money goes to the East Indies to pay for spices, cotton, saltpetre, sugar, candy, tea, cloths, diamonds, and monkeys.

We may afterwards demand, what is become of all the treasures of the Indies? I answer, that Shah-Thamas-Kouli-Khan or Shah-Nadin had carried away all those of the Great Mogul, together with his jewels. You would know where those jewels are, and this money that Shah-Nadin carried with him into Persia? A part was hidden in the earth during the civil wars; predatory leaders made use of the rest to raise troops against one another; for—as Cæsar very well remarks—"with money we get soldiers, and with soldiers we steal money."

Your curiosity is not yet satisfied; you are troubled to know what have become of the treasures of Sesostris, of Crœsus, Cyrus, Nebuchadnezzar, and above all of Solomon, who, it is said, had to his own share equal to twenty millions and more of our pounds in his coffers.

I will tell you. It is spread all over the world. Things find their level in time. Be sure, that in the time of Cyrus, the Gauls, Germany, Denmark, Poland, and Russia, had not a crown.—Besides, that which is lost in gilding, which is fooled away upon our Lady of Loretto, and other places, and which has been swallowed up by the avaricious sea.

How did the Romans under their great Romulus, the son of Mars and a vestal, and under the devout Numa Pompilius? They had a Jupiter of oak; rudely carved huts for palaces; a handful of hay at the end of a stick

Digitized by Google

for a standard; and not a piece of money of twelve sous value in their pockets. Our coachmen have gold watches that the seven kings of Rome, the Camilluses, Manliuses, and Fabiuses, could not have paid for.

If by chance the wife of a receiver-general of finances was to have this chapter read at her toilette by the bel-esprit of the house, she would have a strange contempt for the Romans of the three first centuries and would not allow a Manlius, Curius, or Fabius to enter her antichamber, should he come on foot and not have wherewithal to take his part at play.

Their ready money was of brass. It served at once for arms and money. They fought and reckoned with brass. Three or four pounds of brass of twelve ounces weight paid for an ox. They bought necessaries at market, as we buy them at present, and men had, as in all times, food, clothing, and habitations. The Romans, poorer than their neighbours, conquered them, and continually augmented their territory for the space of five hundred years, before they coined silver money.

The soldiers of Gustavus Adolphus in Sweden had nothing but copper money for their pay, before they made conquests out of their own country.

Provided we have a pledge of exchange for the necessary things of life, commerce will continually go on. It signifies not whether this pledge be of shells or paper. Gold and silver have prevailed everywhere, only because they have been the most rare.

It was in Asia that the first manufactures of money of these two metals commenced, because Asia was the cradle of all the arts.

There certainly was no money in the Trojan war. Gold and silver passed by weight: Agamemnon might have had a treasure, but certainly no money.

What has made several hardy scholars suspect that the Pentateuch was not written until the time in which the Hebrews began to procure coins from their neighbours is, that in more than one passage mention is made of shekels. It is there said, that Abraham, who

Digitized by Google

was a stranger, and had not an inch of land in the country of Canaan, bought there a field and a cave in which to bury his wife, for four hundred shekels of silver current money.* The judicious Dom Calmet values this sum at four hundred and forty-eight livres, six sous, nine deniers, according to the ancient calculations adopted at random, in which the mark of silver was of six-and-twenty livres value. As the mark of silver has however increased by half the sum, the present value would be eight hundred and ninety-six livres.

Now, as in that time there was no coined money answering to the word 'pecunia,' that would make a little difficulty, from which it is not easy to extricate ourselves.†

Another difficulty is, that in one place it is said that Abraham bought this field in Hebron, and in another in Sichem.‡ On that point consult the venerable Bede, Raban, Maure, and Emanuel Sa.

We will now speak of the riches which David left to Solomon in coined money. Some make it amount to twenty-one or twenty-two millions of French livres, others to five-and-twenty. There is no keeper of the royal treasure, nor tefterdan of the grand Turks, who can exactly compute the treasure of king Solomon; but the young bachelors of Oxford and the Sorbonne make out the amount without difficulty.

I will not speak of the innumerable adventures which have happened to money since it has been

* Genesis xxiii. 16.

† The bold scholars, who, under this pretext and several others, attribute the Pentateuch to others than to Moses, further found their opinion on the evidences of St. Theodoret, Mazius, &c. They say, if St. Theodoret and Mazius affirm, that the book of Joshua was not written by Joshua, and is not the less admirable, can we not also believe, that the Pentateuch is very admirable without being written by Moses? See on this point the first book of the Critical History of the Old Testament, by the reverend father Simon of the Oratory. But whatever so many scholars may have said, it is clear that we should attach ourselves to the opinion of the holy Roman and apostolic church, the only infallible one.

‡ Acts vii. 16.

Digitized by Google

stamped, marked, valued, altered, increased, buried, and stolen, having through all its transformations constantly remained the idol of mankind. It is so much loved, that among all christian princes there still exists an old law which is not to allow gold and silver to go out of their kingdoms. This law implies one of two things, either that these princes reign over fools who lavish their money in a foreign country for their pleasure, or that we must not pay our debts to foreigners. It is however clear that no person is foolish enough to give his money without reason, and that when we are in debt to a foreigner we should pay him either in bills of exchange, commodities, or legitimate coin. Thus this law has not been executed since we began to open our eyes—which is not long ago.

There are many things to be said on coined money; as on the unjust and ridiculous augmentation of specie, which suddenly loses considerable sums to a state on the melting down again; on the re-stamping, with an augmentation of ideal value, which augmentation invites all your neighbours and all your enemies to re-coin your money and gain at your expense: in short, on twenty other equally ruinous expedients. Several new books are full of judicious remarks upon this subject. It is more easy to write on money than to obtain it; and those who gain it, jest much at those who only know how to write about it.

In general, the art of government consists in taking as much money as possible from one part of the citizens to give to the other.

It is demanded, if it be possible radically to ruin a kingdom of which the soil in general is fertile? We answer, that the thing is not practicable, since from the war of 1689 to the end of 1769, in which we write, everything has continually been done which could ruin France and leave it without resource, and yet it never could be brought about. It is a sound body which has had a fever of eighty years with relapses, and which has been in the hands of quacks, but which will survive.*

* The truth of this paragraph has been amply proved, but it is equally evident that if ruin could not be produced by so

Digitized by Google

MONSTERS.

The definition of monsters is more difficult than is generally imagined. Are we to apply the term to animals of enormous size; to a fish, or a serpent fifteen feet long, for instance? There are some, however, that are twenty or even thirty feet long, in comparison with which of course the others, instead of enormous or monstrous, would appear small.

There are monsters through defect. But, if a generally well-made and handsome man were destitute from his birth of the little toes and little fingers, would he be a monster? Teeth are more necessary to a man: I have seen a man who never had a tooth. He was in other respects pleasing in his person. Even destitution of the organs of generation, still more necessary in the system of nature, would not constitute the person thus defective a monster.

There are monsters by excess as well as by defect. But those who have six fingers, or three testicles, or two perforations instead of one, or the spine elongated in the form of a small tail, are not considered monsters.

The third kind consists of those which have members of other animals; as for example, a lion with the wings of an ostrich, or a serpent with the wings of an eagle, like the griffin and ixion of the Jews. But all bats have wings, and flying fish have them, without being monsters.

Let us then reserve the name for animals whose deformities strike us with horror.

Yet the first negro, upon this idea, was a monster to white women; and the most admirable of European beauties was a monster in the eyes of negroes.

If Polyphemus and the Cyclops had really existed, people who carried an eye on each side of the root of

---

much misgovernment, it rendered revolution inevitable. In fact, the French revolution was the natural effort of a diseased but robust body, to throw off a complication of disorders which could be borne no longer, and was as inevitable as fever in the natural body under similar circumstances.—T.

Digitized by Google

the nose, would in the island of Lipari, and the neighbourhood of Mount Ætna, have been pronounced monsters.

I once saw, at a fair, a young woman with four nipples or rather dugs, and what resembled the tail of a cow hanging down between them. She was decidedly a monster when she displayed her neck, but was rather an agreeable woman in appearance when she concealed it.

Centaurs and Minotaurs would have been monsters, but beautiful monsters. The well-proportioned body of a horse serving as a base or support to the upper part of a man, would have been a masterpiece of nature's workmanship on earth; just as we draw the masterpieces of heaven, those spirits which we call angels, and which we paint and sculpture in our churches, adorned sometimes with two wings, sometimes with four, and sometimes even with six.

We have already asked, with the judicious Locke, what is the boundary of distinction between the human and merely animal figure; what is the point of monstrosity at which it would be proper to take your stand against baptizing an infant, against admitting it as a member of the human species, against according to it the possession of a soul? We have seen that this boundary is as difficult to be settled, as it is difficult to ascertain what a soul is; for there certainly are none who know what it is but theologians.

Why should the satyrs which St. Jerome saw, the offspring of women and baboons, have been reputed monsters? Might it not be thought, on the contrary, that their lot was in reality happier than our's? Must they not have possessed more strength and more agility? and would they not have laughed at us as an unfortunate race, to whom nature had refused both tails and clothing? A mule, the offspring of two different species; a jumart, the offspring of a bull and a mare; a tarin, the offspring, we are told, of a canary-bird and hen linnet—are not monsters.

But how is it that mules, jumarts, and tarins, which are thus produced in nature, do not themselves re-

Digitized by Google

produce? And how do the seminists, ovists, or animalculists explain, upon their respective theories, the formation of these mongrel productions?

I will tell you plainly, that they do not explain it at all. The seminists never discovered how it is that the ass communicates to his mule offspring a resemblance only in the ears and crupper; the ovists neither inform us, nor understand, how a mare should contain in her egg anything but an animal of her own species. And the animalculists cannot perceive, how a minute embryo of an ass could introduce its ears into the matrix of a mare.

The theorist who, in a work intitled the Philosophy of Venus, maintained, that all animals and all monsters are formed by attraction, was still less successful than those just mentioned, in accounting for phenomena so common and yet so surprising.

Alas! my good friends; you none of you know how you originate your own offspring; you are ignorant of the secrets of nature in your own species, and yet vainly attempt to develop them in the mule!

It may however be confidently presumed, in reference to a monster by defect, that the whole seminal matter did not reach its destined appropriation; or perhaps that the small spermatic worm had lost a portion of its substance; or perhaps that the egg was crazed and injured. With respect to a monster by excess, you may imagine that some portions of the seminal matter superabounded; that of two spermatic worms united, one could only animate a single member of the animal, and that that member remains in supererogation; that two eggs have blended together, and that one of them has produced but a single member, which was joined to the body of the other.

But what would you say of so many monstrosities arising from the addition of parts of animals of a totally different species? How would you explain a crab on the neck of a girl? or the tail of a rat upon the thigh? or, above all, the four dugs and tail of a cow, which which exhibited at the fair at St. Germain? You would be reduced to the supposition, that the unfor-

Digitized by Google

tunate woman's mother belonged to the very extraordinary family of Pasiphaë.

Let each of us boldly and honestly say, How little is it that I really know.

MORALITY.

Babblers, preachers, extravagant controversialists! endeavour to remember that your master never announced that the sacrament was the visible sign of an invisible thing: he has nowhere admitted four cardinal virtues, and three divine ones. He has never decided whether his mother came into the world maculate or immaculate. Cease, therefore, to repeat things which never entered into his mind. He has said, in conformity with a truth as ancient as the world: Love God and your neighbour. Abide by that precept, miserable cavillers! Preach morality and nothing more. Observe it, and let the tribunals no longer echo with your prosecutions: snatch no longer, by the claw of an attorney, their morsel of bread from the widow and the orphan. Dispute not concerning some petty benefice with the same fury as the papacy was disputed in the great schism of the west. Monks! place not to the utmost of your power, the universe under contribution; and we may then be able to believe you.

I have just read these words in a piece of declamation in fourteen volumes, intitled The History of the Lower Empire—"The christians had a morality, but the pagans had none."

Oh, M. Le Beau! author of these fourteen volumes, where did you pick up this absurdity? What becomes of the morality of Socrates, of Zaleucus, of Charondas, of Cicero, of Epictetus, and of Marcus Aurelius?

There is but one morality, M. Le Beau, as there is but one geometry. But you will tell me, that the greater part of mankind are ignorant of geometry. True; but if they apply a little to the study of it, all men draw the same conclusions. Agriculturists, manufacturers, artisans do not go through a regular course of morality: they read neither the 'De Finibus'

Digitized by Google

of Cicero, or the 'Ethics' of Aristotle; but as soon as they reflect, they are, without knowing it, disciples of Cicero. The Indian dyer, the Tartarian shepherd, and the English seaman, are acquainted with justice and injustice. Confucius did not invent a system of morals, as men construct physical systems. He found his in the hearts of all mankind.

This morality existed in the bosom of the prætor Festus, when the Jews pressed him to put Paul to death for having taken strangers into their temple. "Learn," said he, "that the Romans never condemn any one unheard."

If the Jews were deficient in a moral sense, the Romans were not, and paid it homage.

There is no morality in superstition; it exists not in ceremonies, and has nothing to do with dogmas. We cannot repeat too frequently that dogmas differ, but that morality is the same among all men who make use of their reason. Morality proceeds from God, like light; our superstitions are only darkness. Reflect, reader; pursue the truth, and draw the consequences.

MOSES.

SECTION I.

PHILOSOPHY, of which we sometimes pass the boundaries, researches of antiquity, and the spirit of discussion and criticism, have been carried so far, that several learned men have finally doubted if there ever was a Moses, and whether this man was not an imaginary being, such as were Perseus, Bacchus, Atlas, Penthesilea, Vesta, Rhea Silvia, Isis, Sammonocodom, Fo, Mercury Trismegistus, Odin, Merlin, Francus, Robert the Devil, and so many other heroes of romance whose lives and prowess have been recorded.

It is not very likely, say the incredulous, that a man ever existed whose life is a continual prodigy.

It is not very likely that he worked so many stupendous miracles in Egypt, Arabia, and Syria, without their being known throughout the world.

Digitized by Google

It is not likely, that no Egyptian or Greek writer should have transmitted these miracles to posterity. They are mentioned by the Jews alone, and in the time that this history was written by them they were not known to any nation, not indeed until towards the second century. The first author who expressly quotes the book of Moses is Longinus, minister of queen Zenobia, in the time of the emperor Aurelian.*

It is to be remarked, that the author of the Mercury Trismegistus, who certainly was an Egyptian, says not a single word of this Moses.

If a single ancient author had related a single one of these miracles, Eusebius would no doubt have triumphed in this evidence, either in his History or in his Evangelical Preparation.

It is true, he mentions authors who have quoted his name, but none who have cited his prodigies. Before him, the Jews, Josephus and Philo, who have so much celebrated their own nation, sought all the writers in which the name of Moses is found, but there was not a single one who made the least mention of the marvellous actions attributed to him.

In this silence of the whole world, the incredulous reason with a temerity which refutes itself.

The Jews are the only people who possessed the Pentateuch, which they attribute to Moses. It is said, even in their books, that this Pentateuch was not known until the reign of their king Josiah, thirty-six years before the destruction and captivity of Jerusalem; and they then only possessed a single copy, which the priest Hilkiah† found at the bottom of a strong box, while counting money. The priest sent it to the king by his scribe Shaphan.

All this, say they, necessarily obscures the authenticity of the Pentateuch.

In short, if the Pentateuch was known to all the Jews, would Solomon—the wise Solomon, inspired by God himself to build a temple—have ornamented this

* Longinus—Treatise on the Sublime.
† 2 Kings xxii.

Digitized by Google

temple with so many statues, contrary to the express order of Moses?

All the Jewish prophets, who prophecied in the name of the Lord from the time of Moses to that of king Josiah, would they not have been supported in all their prophecies, by the laws of Moses? Would they not a thousand times have quoted his own words? Would they not have commented upon them? None of them however quote two lines—no one follows the text of Moses—they even oppose them in several places.

According to these unbelievers, the books attributed to Moses were only written among the Babylonians during the captivity, or immediately afterwards by Esdras. Indeed, we see only Persian and Chaldean terminations, in the Jewish writings—'Babel,' gate of God; 'Phegor-beel,' or 'Beel-phegor,' god of the precipices; 'Zebuth beel,' or 'Beel-zebuth,' god of insects; 'Bethel,' house of God; 'Daniel,' judgment of God; 'Gabriel,' man of God; 'Jahel,' afflicted of God; 'Jael,' the life of God; 'Israel,' seeing God; 'Oviel,' strength of God; 'Raphael,' help of God; 'Uriel,' fire of God.

Thus, all is foreign in the Jewish nation, a stranger itself in Palestine; circumcision, ceremonies, sacrifices, the ark, the cherubim, the goat Hazazel, baptism of justice, simple baptism, proofs, divination, interpretation of dreams, enchantment of serpents,—nothing originated among these people, nothing was invented by them.

The celebrated lord Bolingbroke believed not that Moses ever existed: he thought he saw in the Pentateuch a crowd of contradictions and puzzling chronological and geographical faults; names of towns not then built, precepts given to kings at a time when not only the Jews had no kings, but in which it is probable there were none, since they lived in deserts, in tents, in the manner of the Bedouin Arabs.

What appears to him above all the most palpable contradiction, is the gift of forty-eight cities with their suburbs, made to the Levites in a country in which there was not a single village; and it is principally on

Digitized by Google

these forty-eight cities that he refutes Abbadie, and even has the cruelty to treat him with the aversion and contempt of a lord of the upper chamber, or a minister of state towards a petty foreign priest who would be so impertinent as to reason with him.

I will take the liberty of representing to viscount Bolingbroke and to all those who think with him, not only that the Jewish nation has always believed in the existence of Moses, and in that of his books, but that even Jesus Christ has acknowledged him. The four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, recognise him. St. Matthew says expressly, that Moses and Elias appeared to Jesus Christ on the mountain during the night of the transfiguration, and St. Luke says the same.

Jesus Christ declares in St. Matthew, that he is not come to abolish this law, but to accomplish it. In the New Testament we are often referred to the law of Moses, and to the prophets. The whole church has always believed the Pentateuch written by Moses; and further, of five hundred different societies, which have been so long established in Christendom, none have ever doubted of the existence of this great prophet. We must therefore submit our reason, as so many men have done before us.

I know very well that I shall gain nothing in the mind of the viscount, or of those of his opinion. They are too well persuaded that the Jewish books were not written until very late, and during the captivity of the two tribes which remained. But we shall possess the consolation of having the church with us.

SECTION II.

If you would be instructed and amused with antiquity, read the Life of Moses in the article APOCRYPHA.

In vain have several scholars believed that the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses.* They

* Is it true that there was a Moses? If a man who commanded entire nature existed among the Egyptians, would not such prodigious events have constituted the principal part of the history of Egypt? Sanchoniathon, Manethon, Megasthenes, and

Digitized by Google

say that it is affirmed even by the scripture, that the first known copy was found in the time of king Josiah, and that this single copy was brought to the king by the secretary Shaphan. Now, between the time of Moses and this adventure of the secretary Shaphan, there were one thousand one hundred and sixty-seven years, by the Hebrew computation. For God appeared to Moses in the burning bush, in the year of the world 2213, and the secretary Shaphan published the book of the law in the year of the world 3380. This book found under Josiah, was unknown until the return from the Babylonish captivity; and it is said that it was Esdras, inspired by God, who brought the holy scriptures to light.

But whether it was Esdras or another who digested this book, is absolutely indifferent, since it is inspired. It is not said in the Pentateuch, that Moses was the author, we might therefore be permitted to attribute it to the declaration of some other divine mind, if the church had not decided that the book is by Moses.

Herodotus, would they not have spoken of them? Josephus the historian has collected all possible evidences in favour of the Jews. He dares not say that any of the authors which he quotes have said a single word of the miracles of Moses. What! could the Nile have been changed into blood?—an angel have slain the first born of Egypt?—the sea have been opened, and its waters piled up on the right and on the left, and no author speak of it! Great nations have forgotten these prodigies, and it is only a little nation of barbarous slaves who has told us these histories thousands of years after the events.

Who then is this Moses, unknown to the whole world until the time in which it is said a Ptolemy had the curiosity to cause the Jewish writings to be translated into Greek? A great many ages back, the Oriental fables attributed to Bacchus all that the Jews have said of Moses. Bacchus passed the Red Sea dry-footed; Bacchus changed the waters into blood; Bacchus daily worked miracles with his rod,—all these facts were sung in the orgies of Bacchus before: they had the least commerce with the Jews, before they even knew if these poor people had books. Is it not most likely that this people so new, so long time wandering, so lately known, and so recently settled in Palestine, with the Phenician language took the Phenician fables, on which they improved, and thus they became great imitators? A people so poor, so ignorant, so foreign to all the arts, could they do otherwise than copy their neighbours? Know we not that the names Adonai, Jehovah, Eloi, or Eloa, which signified God among the Jews, were all Phenician?

Digitized by Google

Some opposers add, that no prophet has quoted the books of the Pentateuch, that there is no mention of it either in the Psalms or in the books attributed to Solomon, in Jeremiah or Isaiah, or in short, in any canonical book of the Jews. Words answering to those of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy are not found in any other language recognised by them as authentic.

Others, still more bold, have put the following questions:—

1st. In what language could Moses have written in a savage desert? It could only be in Egyptian; for by this same book we are told, that Moses and all his people were born in Egypt. It is therefore probable that they spoke no other language. The Egyptians had yet made no use of papyrus; they engraved hieroglyphics on tables of wood or marble. It is even said, that the tables of the commandments were engraved on polished stones, which required prodigious time and labour.

2nd. Is it likely, that in a desert where the Jewish people had neither shoe-maker nor tailor—in which the God of the universe was obliged to work a continual miracle to preserve the old dresses and shoes of the Jews, men could be found clever enough to engrave the five books of the Pentateuch on marble or wood? You will say, that they found labourers who made a golden calf in one night, and who afterwards reduced the gold into powder—an operation impracticable to common chemistry, which was not yet discovered? Who constructed the tabernacle? Who ornamented thirty columns of brass with capitals of silver? Who wove and embroidered veils of linen with hyacinth, purple, and scarlet? An account that supports the opinion of the contradictors. They answer, that it was not possible that in a desert, where they were in want of everything, for them to perform works so intricate; that they must have began by making shoes and tunics; that those who wanted necessaries could not indulge in luxuries; and that it is an evident contradiction to say,

Digitized by Google

that they had founders, engravers, and embroiderers, when they had neither clothes nor bread.

3rd. If Moses had written the first chapter of Genesis would all young people have been forbidden to read the first chapter? Would so little respect have been paid to the legislator? If it was Moses who said that God punished the iniquity of the fathers to the fourth generation, would Ezekiel have dared to say the contrary?

4th. If Moses wrote Leviticus could he have contradicted it in Deuteronomy? Leviticus forbids a woman to marry her brother, Deuteronomy commands it.

5th. Could Moses have spoken of towns which existed not in his time? Would he have said that towns which, in regard to him, were on the east of the Jordan were on the west?

6th. Would he have assigned forty-eight cities to the Levites, in a country in which there were never ten, and in a desert in which he had always wandered without habitation?

7th. Would he have prescribed rules for the Jewish kings, when not only there were no kings among this people but they were held in horror, and it was not probable they ever would have any?—What! would Moses have given precepts for the conduct of kings who came not until five hundred years after him, and have said nothing in relation to the judges and priests who succeeded him? Does not this religion lead us to believe that the Pentateuch was composed in the time of kings, and that the ceremonies instituted by Moses were only traditional.

8th. Suppose he had said to the Jews,—I have made you depart to the number of six hundred thousand combatants from the land of Egypt under the protection of your God? The Jews, would they not have answered him,—You must have been very timid not to lead us against Pharoah of Egypt; he could not have opposed to us an army of two hundred thousand men. There never was such an army on foot in Egypt; we should have conquered them easily; we should have been the masters of their country.—What! has the

Digitized by Google

God, who talks to you, to please us slain all the first-born of Egypt, which, if there were in this country three hundred thousand families, makes three hundred thousand men destroyed in one night, simply to revenge us, and yet you have not seconded your God and given us that fertile country which nothing could withhold from us. On the contrary, you have made us depart from Egypt as thieves and cowards, to perish in deserts between mountains and precipices. You might at least have conducted us by the direct road to this land of Canaan, to which we have no right, but which you have promised us, and on which we have not yet been able to enter.

It was natural that from the land of Goshen we should march towards Tyre and Sidon, along the Mediterranean, but you made us entirely pass the Isthmus of Suez and re-enter Egypt, proceed as far as Memphis, when we find ourselves at Beel-Sephon on the borders of the Red Sea, turning our backs on the land of Canaan, having journeyed eighty leagues in this Egypt which we wished to avoid, so as at last to nearly perish between the sea and the army of Pharaoh!

If you had wished to deliver us to our enemies, you could not have taken a different route and other measures. God has saved us by a miracle, you say, the sea opened to let us pass; but after such a favour should he let us die of hunger and fatigue in the horrible deserts of Kadesh-barnea, Mara, Elim, Horeb, and Sinai? All our fathers perished in these frightful solitudes; and you tell us at the end of forty years, that God took particular care of them.

This is what these murmuring Jews, these unjust children of the vagabonds who died in the desert, might have said to Moses, if he had read Exodus and Genesis to them. And what might they not have said and done on the article of the golden calf? What! you dare to tell us that your brother made a calf for our fathers, when you were with God on the mountain? You, who sometimes tell us that you have spoken to God face to face, and sometimes that you could only see his back! But no matter, you were with this God, and your bro-

Digitized by Google

then cast a golden calf in one day, and gave it to us to adore it; and instead of punishing your unworthy brother you make him our chief priest, and order your Levites to slay twenty-three thousand men of your people. Would our fathers have suffered this? Would they have allowed themselves to be sacrificed like so many victims by sanguinary priests? You tell us that, not content with this incredible butchery, you have further massacred twenty-four thousand of our poor followers because one of them slept with a Midianitish woman, whilst you yourself espoused a Midianite; and yet you add that you are the mildest of men! A few more instances of this mildness, and not a soul would have remained.

No, if you have been capable of all this cruelty, if you can have exercised it, you would be the most barbarous of men, and no punishment would suffice to expiate so great a crime.

These are nearly the objections which all scholars make to those who think that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch. But we answer them, that the ways of God are not those of men; that God has proved, conducted, and abandoned his people by a wisdom which is unknown to us; that the Jews themselves for more than two thousand years have believed that Moses is the author of these books; that the church, which has succeeded the synagogue, and which is equally infallible, has decided this point of controversy, and that scholars should remain silent when the church pronounces.

SECTION III.*

We cannot doubt that there was a Moses, a legislator of the Jews. We will here examine his history, following merely the rules of criticism; the Divine is not submitted to similar examination. We must confine ourselves to the probable; men can only judge as men. It is very natural and very probable, that an Arab nation

* This third section is extracted from the manuscript of which we have spoken in the advertisement. We have thought proper to preserve this article, though it is found in part in the preceding ones.—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

dwelt on the confines of Egypt, on the side of Arabia Deserta; that it was tributary or slave to the Egyptian kings; and that afterwards it sought to establish itself elsewhere; but that which reason alone cannot admit is, that this nation, composed of seventy persons at most in the time of Joseph, increased in two hundred and fifteen years, from Joseph to Moses, to the number of six hundred thousand combatants, according to the book of Exodus, which six hundred thousand men capable of bearing arms imply a multitude of about two millions, counting old men, women, and children. It is not certainly in the course of nature for a colony of seventy persons, as many males as females, to produce in two centuries two millions of inhabitants. The calculations made on this progression by men very little versed in the things of this world are falsified by the experience of all nations, and all times. Children are not made by a stroke of the pen. Reflect well that at this rate a population of ten thousand persons in two hundred years would produce more inhabitants than the globe of the earth could sustain.

Is it not more probable, that these six hundred thousand combatants, favoured by the author of Nature who worked for them so many prodigies, were forced to wander in the deserts in which they died, instead of seeking to possess themselves of fertile Egypt?

By these rules of an established and reasonable human criticism, we must agree that it is very likely that Moses conducted a small people from the confines of Egypt. There was among the Egyptians an ancient tradition, related by Plutarch in his Treatise on Isis and Osiris, that Tiphon, the father of Jerosselaim and Juddecus, fled from Egypt on an ass. It is clear from this passage that the ancestors of the Jews, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, were supposed to have been fugitives from Egypt. A tradition, no less ancient and more general, is, that the Jews were driven from Egypt, either as a troop of unruly brigands, or a people infected with leprosy. This double accusation carries its probability even from the land of Goshen, which they had inhabited, a neighbouring land of the

Digitized by Google

vagabond Arabs, and where the disease of leprosy, peculiar to the Arabs, might be common. It appears even by the scripture, that this people went from Egypt against their will. The seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy forbids kings to think of leading the Jews back to Egypt.

The conformity of several Egyptian and Jewish customs still more strengthens the opinion that this people was an Egyptian colony, and what gives it a new degree of probability is, the feast of the Passover; that is to say, of the flight or passage instituted in memory of their evasion. This feast alone would be no proof; for among all people there are solemities established to celebrate fabulous and incredible events; such were most of the feasts of the Greeks and Romans; but a flight from one country to another is nothing uncommon, and calls for belief. The proof drawn from this feast of the Passover receives a still greater force by that of the tabernacles, in memory of the time in which the Jews inhabited the desert on their departure from Egypt. These similitudes, united with so many others, prove that a colony really went from Egypt, and finally established itself for some time at Palestine.

Almost all the rest is of a kind so marvellous, that human sagacity cannot digest it. All that we can do is to seek the time in which the history of this flight, that is to say, the book of Exodus, can have been written, and to examine the opinions which then prevailed; opinions of which the proof is in the book itself, compared with the ancient customs of nations.

With regard to the books attributed to Moses, the most common rules of criticism permit us not to believe that he can be the author of them.

1st. It is not likely that he spoke of the places by names which were not given to them until long afterwards. In this book mention is made of the cities of Jair, and every one agrees that they were not so named until long after the death of Moses. It also speaks of the country of Dan, and the tribe of

Digitized by Google

Dan had not given its name to the country of which it was not yet the master.

2nd. How could Moses have quoted the book of the wars of the Lord, when these wars and this book were after his time?

3rd. How could Moses speak of the pretended defeat of a giant named Og, king of Bashan, vanquished in the desert in the last year of his government? And how could he add, that he further saw his bed of iron of nine cubits long in Rabath? This city of Rabath was the capital of the Ammonites, into whose country the Hebrews had not yet penetrated. Is it not apparent that such a passage is the production of a posterior writer, which his inadvertence betrays? As an evidence of the victory gained over the giant, he brings forward the bed said to be still at Rabath, forgetting that it is Moses whom he makes speak, who was dead long before.

4th. How could Moses have called cities beyond the Jordan, which, with regard to him, were on this side? Is it not palpable, that the book attributed to him was written a long time after the Israelites had crossed this little river Jordan, which they never passed under his conduct?

5th. Is it likely that Moses told his people, that in the last year of his government he took, in the little province of Argob, a sterile and frightful country of Arabia Petræa, sixty great towns surrounded with high fortified walls, independent of an infinite number of open cities? Is it not much more probable, that these exaggerations were afterwards written by a man who wished to flatter a stupid nation?

6th. It is still less likely, that Moses related the miracles with which this history is filled.

It is easy to persuade a happy and victorious people that God has fought for them; but it is not in human nature that a people should believe a hundred miracles in their favour, when all these prodigies ended only in making them perish in a desert. Let us examine some of the miracles related in Exodus.

Digitized by Google

7th. It appears contradictory and injurious to the divine essence to suppose that God, having formed a people to be the sole depository of his laws, and to reign over all nations, should send a man of this people to demand of the king, their oppressor, permission to go into the desert to sacrifice to his God, that this people might escape under the pretence of this sacrifice. Our common ideas cannot forbear attaching an idea of baseness and knavery to this management, far from recognising the majesty and power of the Supreme Being.

When, immediately after, we read that Moses changed his rod into a serpent, before the king, and turned all the waters of the kingdom into blood; that he caused frogs to be produced which covered the surface of the earth; that he changed all the dust into lice, and filled the air with venomous winged insects; that he afflicted all the men and animals of the country with frightful ulcers; that he called hail, tempests, and thunder, to ruin all the country; that he covered it with locusts; that he plunged it in fearful darkness for three days; that, finally, an exterminating angel struck with death all the first-born of men and animals in Egypt, commencing with the son of the king;—again, when we afterwards see his people walking across the Red Sea, the waves suspended in mountains to the right and left, and afterwards falling on the army of Pharaoh, which they swallowed up—when, I say, we read all these miracles, the first idea which comes into our minds is, that this people, for whom God performed such astonishing things, no doubt became the masters of the universe. But no, the fruit of so many wonders was, that they suffered want and hunger in arid sands; and—prodigy on prodigy—all died without seeing the little corner of earth in which their descendants afterwards, for some years, established themselves! It is no doubt pardonable if we disbelieve this crowd of prodigies, at the least of which reason so decidedly revolts.

This reason, left to itself, cannot be persuaded that Moses wrote such strange things. How can we make

Digitized by Google

a generation believe so many miracles uselessly wrought for it, and all of which, it is said, were performed in the desert? What being, enjoying divine power, would employ it in preserving the clothes and shoes of these people, after having armed all nature in their favour?

It is therefore very natural to think, that all this prodigious history was written a long time after Moses, as the romances of Charlemagne were forged three centuries after him; and as the origins of all nations have not been written until they were out of sight, the imagination has been left at liberty to invent. The more coarse and unfortunate a people are, the more they seek to exalt their ancient history; and what people have been longer miserable, or more barbarous than the Jews?

It is not to be believed, that when they had not wherewithal to make shoes in their deserts, under the government of Moses, that there were any curious enough to write. We should presume, that the poor creatures born in these deserts did not receive a very brilliant education; and that the nation only began to read and write when it had some commerce with Phenicia. It was probably in the commencement of monarchy that the Jews, feeling they had some genius, wrote the Pentateuch, and adjusted their traditions. Would they have made Moses recommend kings to read and write even his law in a time in which there were none? Is it not probable, that the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy was composed to moderate the power of royalty; and that it was written by priests in the time of Saul?

It is most likely at this epoch, that we must place the digest of the Pentateuch. The frequent slaveries this people were subject to, seem badly calculated to establish literature in a nation, and to render books very common; and the more rare these books were in the commencement, the more the authors ventured to fill them with miracles.

The Pentateuch, attributed to Moses, is no doubt, very ancient; if it was put in order in the time of Saul and Solomon, it was about the time of the Trojan

Digitized by Google

war, and is one of the most curious monuments of the manner of thinking of that time. We see that all known nations, in proportion to their ignorance, were fond of prodigies. All was then performed by celestial ministry in Egypt, Phrygia, Greece, and Asia.

The authors of the Pentateuch give us to understand, that every nation has its gods, and that these gods have all nearly an equal power.

If Moses, in the name of God, changed his rod into a serpent, the priests of Pharaoh did as much; if he changed all the waters of Egypt into blood, even to that which was in the vases, the priests immediately performed the same prodigy, without our being able to conceive on what waters they performed this metamorphosis; at least, unless they expressly created new waters for the purpose. The Jewish writers prefer being reduced to this absurdity, rather than allow us to suspect that the gods of Egypt had not the power of changing water into blood, as well as the God of Jacob.

But when the latter fills the land of Egypt with lice, changing all the dust into them, his entire superiority appears; the magi cannot imitate it, and they make the God of the Jews speak thus, "Pharaoh shall know that nothing is equal to me." These words put into his mouth, merely mark a being who believes himself more powerful than his rivals; he was equalled in the metamorphosis of a rod into a serpent, and in that of the waters into blood; but he gains the victory in the article of the lice and the following miracles.

This idea of the supernatural power of priests of all countries, is displayed in several places of scripture. When Balaam, the priest of the little state of a petty king, named Balak, in the midst of deserts, is near cursing the Jews, their God appears to him to prevent him. It seems that the malediction of Balaam was much to be feared. To restrain this priest, it is not enough that God speaks to him, he sends before him an angel with a sword, and speaks himself again by the mouth of his ass. All these precautions certainly prove the opinion which then prevailed, that the r

Digitized by Google

diction of a priest, whatever it was, drew fatal consequences after it.

This idea of a God superior to other gods, though he made heaven and earth, was so rooted in all minds; that Solomon in his last prayer cries, "Oh! my God, there is no other god like thee in earth or heaven." It is this opinion which rendered the Jews so credulous respecting the sorceries and enchantments of other nations.

It is this which gave rise to the story of the Witch of Endor, who had the power of invoking the shade of Saul. Every people had their prodigies and oracles, and it never even came into the minds of any nations to doubt the miracles and prophecies of others. They were contented with opposing similar arms; it seems as if the priests, in denying the prodigies of other nations, feared to discredit their own. This kind of theology prevailed a long time over all the earth.

It is not for us to enter here on the detail of all that is written on Moses. We speak of his laws in more than one place in this work. We will here confine ourselves to remarking, how much we are astonished to see a legislator inspired by God; a prophet through whom God himself speaks, proposing to us no future life. There is not a single word in Leviticus, which can lead us to suspect the immortality of the soul. The reply to this overwhelming difficulty is, that God proportioned himself to the ignorance of the Jews. What a miserable answer! it was for God to elevate the Jews to necessary knowledge; not to lower himself to them. If the soul is immortal, if there are rewards and punishments in another life, it is necessary for men to be informed of it. If God spoke, he must have informed them of this fundamental dogma. What legislator, what god but this, proposes to his people wine, oil, and milk alone! What god but this always encourages his believers, as a chief of robbers encourages his troops, with the hope of plunder only! Once more, it is very pardonable for mere human reason simply to see in such a history, the barbarous stupidity of the first ages of a savage people. Man, whatever he does, cannot reason otherwise; but if God

Digitized by Google

really is the author of the Pentateuch, we must submit without reasoning.

MOTION.

A PHILOSOPHER in the neighbourhood of mount Krapak argued with me that motion is essential to matter.

"Everything moves," says he; "the sun continually revolves on his own axis; the planets do the same, and every planet has many different motions; everything is a sieve;—everything passes through a sieve; the hardest metal is pierced with an infinity of pores, by which escapes a constant torrent of vapours that circulate in space. The universe is nothing but motion; motion therefore is essential to matter."

"But sir," said I to him; "might not any one say, in answer to what you have advanced—This block of marble, this cannon, this house, this motiun, are not in motion; therefore motion is not essential."

"They do move," he replied; "they move in space together with the earth by the common motion, and they move so incontestably (although insensibly) by their own peculiar motion; that, at the expiration of an indefinite number of centuries, there will remain not a single atom of the masses which now constitute them, from which particles are detaching themselves every passing moment."

"But, my good sir, I can conceive matter to be in a state of rest; motion, therefore, cannot be considered essential to it."

"Why, certainly, it must be of vast consequence whether you conceive it to be, or conceive it not to be, in a state of rest. I still repeat, that it is impossible for it to be so."

"That is a bold assertion; but what, let me ask you, will you say to chaos?"

"Oh, chaos! If we were inclined to talk about chaos, I should tell you that all was necessarily in motion, and that 'the breath of God moved upon the waters;' that the element of water was recognized in

Digitized by Google

existence, and that the other elements existed also; that, consequently, fire existed; that there cannot be fire without motion, that motion is essential to fire. You will not succeed much with chaos."

"Alas! who can succeed with all these subjects of dispute? But, as you are so very fully acquainted with these things, I must request you to inform me why one body impels another: whether it is because matter is impenetrable, or because two bodies cannot be together in one place; or because, in every case of every description, the weak is driven before the strong?"

"Your last reason is rather more facetious than philosophical. No person has hitherto been able to discover the cause of the communication of motion."

"That however does not prevent its being essential to matter. No one has ever been able to discover the cause of sensation in animals, yet this sensation is so essential to them, that, if you exclude the idea of it, you no longer have the idea of an animal.

"Well, I will concede to you, for a moment, that motion is essential to matter (just for a moment let it be remembered, for I am not much inclined to embroil myself with the theologians); and now, after this admission, tell me how one ball produces motion in another?"

"You are very curious and inquisitive; you wish me to inform you of what no philosopher ever knew."

"It appears rather curious, and even ludicrous, that we should know the laws of motion, and yet be profoundly ignorant of the principle of the communication of motion!"

"It is the same with everything else; we know the laws of reasoning, but we know not what it is in us that reasons. The ducts through which our blood, and other animal fluids pass, are very well known to us, but we know not what forms that blood and those fluids. We are in life, but we know not in what the vital principle consists."

"Inform me however at least, whether, if motion be essential to matter, there has not always existed the same quantity of motion in the world?"

Digitized by Google

"That is an old chimera of Epicurus revived by Descartes. I do not, for my own part, see that this equality of motion in the world is more necessary than an equality of triangles. It is essential that a triangle should have three angles and three sides, but it is not essential that the number of triangles on this globe should be always equal."

"But is there not always an equality of forces, as other philosophers express it."*

"That is a similar chimera. We must, upon such a principle, suppose that there is always an equal number of men, and animals, and moving beings, which is absurd."

By the way, what, let me ask, is the force of a body in motion? It is the product of its quantity multiplied by its velocity in a given time. Calling the quantity of a body four, and its velocity four; the force of its impulse will be equal to sixteen. Another quantity we will assume to be two, and its velocity two; the force with which that impels is as four. This is the grand principle of mechanics. Leibnitz decidedly and pompously pronounced the principle defective. He maintained that it was necessary to measure that force; that product, by the quantity multiplied by the square of the velocity. But this was mere captious sophistry and chicanery, an ambiguity unworthy of a philosopher, founded on an abuse of the discovery of the great Galileo, that the spaces traversed with a motion uniformly accelerated were, to each other, as the squares of the times and velocities.

Leibnitz did not consider the time, which he ought to have considered. No English mathematician adopted

* There is always an equality of active forces, under two limitations; first, that if a variable force, depending on the time or place of a body, influences its motion, it is no longer the sum of the forces that remains the same, but the sum of active forces with the addition of a certain mutable quantity depending on that force. Secondly, that this equality of active forces ceases to exist as often as we are compelled to suppose a change which does not take place insensibly. Thus, the principle may be true as a mathematical principle and meet the definition, but not as a metaphysical principle.

Digitized by Google

his system. It was received for a while by a small number of geometricians in France. It pervaded some books, and even the philosophical institutions of a person of great celebrity. Maupertuis is very abusive of Mairan, in a little work entitled A, B, C; as if he thought it necessary to teach the *a*, *b*, *c*, of science to any man who followed the old and, in fact, the true system of calculation. Mairan was however in the right. He adhered to the ancient measurement, that of the quantity multiplied by the velocity. He gradually prevailed over his antagonists, and his system recovered its former station: the scandal of mathematics disappeared, and the quackery of the square of the velocity was dismissed at last to the extramundane spaces, to the limbo of vanity, together with the monads which Leibnitz supposed to constitute the concentric mirror of nature, and also with his elaborate and fanciful system of 'pre-established harmony.'

MOUNTAIN.

The fable of the mountain which, after alarming the whole neigbourhood with its outcries in labour, was ridiculed by all present when it became delivered of a mouse, is at once ancient and universal. The company, however, who thus gave way to ridicule were not a company of philosophers. Those who mocked should in reality have admired. A mountain's being delivered of a mouse was an event as extraordinary, and as worthy of admiration, as a mouse's being delivered of a mountain. A rock's producing a rat is a case absolutely prodigious, and the world never beheld anything approaching to such a miracle. All the worlds in the universe could not originate a fly. Thus, in cases where the vulgar mock, the philosopher admires; and where the vulgar strain their eyes in stupid astonishment, he often smiles.

Digitized by Google

NAIL.

We only ask here, from the censors of books, permission to transcribe from that which the Dominican missionary Labat, proveditor of the holy office, has written concerning the nails of the cross, into which it is more than probable no nail was ever driven.

"The Italian priest who conducted us had sufficient interest to get us, among other things, a sight of the nails with which our Saviour was fastened to the cross. They appeared to me very different from those which the Benedictines show at St. Denis. Possibly those belonging to St. Denis served for the feet, and the others for the hands. It was necessary that those for the hands should be sufficiently large and strong to support all the weight of the body. However, the Jews must either have made use of more than four nails, or some of those which are shown to the faithful are not genuine. History relates, that St. Helena threw one of them into the sea, to appease a furious tempest which assailed the ship in which she had embarked. Constantine made use of another, to make a bit for the bridle of his horse. One is shown entire at St. Denis in France; another also entire at the Holy Cross of Jerusalem at Rome. A very celebrated Roman author of our day asserts, that the iron crown with which they crown the emperors in Italy was made out of one of these nails. We are shown at Rome and at Carpentras two bridle bits also made of these nails, not to mention more at other places. To be sure, several of them are discreet enough to say, that it is the head or point only of these nails which they exhibit."

The missionary speaks in the same tone of all the relics. He observes in the same passage, that when the body of the first deacon St. Stephen was brought from Jerusalem to Rome, in 557, and placed in the tomb of the deacon of St. Lawrence, "St. Lawrence made way of himself to give the right hand to his

Digitized by Google

predecessor; an action which procured him the name of the civil Spaniard." *

Upon this passage we venture only one reflection, which is, that if some philosopher had said as much, in the Encyclopædia, as the Dominican Labat, a crowd of Pantouillets, Nonottes, Chiniacs, Chaumeix, and other knaves, would have exclaimed—Deist, atheist, and geometrician! According to circumstances things change their names.

Selon ce que l'on peut être
Les choses changent de nom.
Amphytrion—Prologue.

NATURE.

Dialogue between the Philosopher and Nature.

THE PHILOSOPHER.

WHAT are you, Nature? I live in you; but I have been searching for you for fifty years, and have never yet been able to find you.

NATURE.

The ancient Egyptians, whose lives it is said extended to twelve hundred years, attached the same reproach to me. They called me Isis; they placed a thick veil over my head; and they said that no one could ever raise it.

PHILOSOPHER.

It is on that account that I apply immediately to yourself. I have been able to measure some of your globes, to ascertain their courses, and to point out the laws of motion; but I have never been able to ascertain what you are yourself.

Are you always active? Are you always passive? Do your elements arrange themselves, as water places itself over sand, oil over water, and air over oil? Have

* This same missionary Labat, who never fails to fall rudely on the relics and miracles of the other monks, speaks with a noble assurance of all the prodigies and pre-eminences of the order of St. Dominic. No writer has carried conventual self-love so far as Labat.

Digitized by Google

you a mind which directs all your operations—as councils are inspired as soon as they meet, although the individual members composing them are often ignorant? Explain to me, I entreat, the enigma in which you are enveloped.

NATURE.

I am the great universal system. I know nothing farther. I am no mathematician, and yet everything in and about me is arranged agreeably to mathematical laws. Conjecture, if you can, how all this is effected.

PHILOSOPHER.

Certainly, since your great universal system knows nothing of mathematics, and yet the laws by which you are regulated are those of the most profound geometry, there must necessarily be an eternal geometrician, who directs you, and presides over your operations.

NATURE.

You are perfectly right; I am water, earth, fire, air, metal, mineral, stone, vegetable, and animal. I clearly perceive that there is an intelligence in me: you possess an intelligence, although you see it not. Neither do I see mine; I feel this invisible power; I am unable to know it: why should you, who are only a very minute portion of myself, be anxious to know what I myself am ignorant of?

PHILOSOPHER.

We are curious. I should be pleased to learn how it is, that while so rough and coarse in your mountains, and deserts, and seas, you are at the same time so ingenious and finished in your animals and vegetables?

NATURE.

My poor child, shall I tell you the real truth? I have had bestowed upon me a name that does not at all suit me: I am called nature, while I am all art.

PHILOSOPHER.

That word deranges all my ideas. What! is it possible that nature should be nothing but art?

NATURE.

It is undoubtedly the case. Do you not know that there is infinite art in those seas and mountains which you represent as so rough and so coarse? Do you not know

Digitized by Google

that all those waters gravitate towards the centre of the earth, and are raised only by immutable laws; and that those mountains which crown the earth are immense reservoirs of eternal snows, incessantly producing the fountains, lakes, and rivers, without which my animal and vegetable offspring would inevitably perish? And, with respect to what are denominated my animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, constituting thus only three kingdoms, be assured that I have in fact millions of them. But if you consider the formation of an insect, of an ear of corn, of gold or of copper, all will exhibit to you prodigies of art.

PHILOSOPHER.

It is undoubtedly true. The more I reflect on the subject, the more clearly I perceive, that you are only the art of some Great Being, extremely powerful and skilful, who conceals himself and exhibits you. All the reasoners, from the time of Thales, and probably long before him, have been playing at hide and seek with you. They have said, I have hold of you; and they in fact held nothing. We all resemble Ixion: he thought he embraced Juno, when he embraced only a cloud.

NATURE.

Since I am the whole that exists, how is it possible for a being like you, so small a portion of myself, to comprehend me? Be contented, my dear little atomic children, with seeing a few particles that surround you, with drinking a few drops of my milk, with vegetating for a few moments in my bosom, and at last dying without any knowledge of your mother and your nurse.

PHILOSOPHER.

My beloved mother, pray tell me a little why you exist—why anything has existed?

NATURE.

I will answer you in the language in which I always have answered, for so long a series of ages, those who have interrogated me on the subject of first principles,—"I know nothing at all about the matter."

PHILOSOPHER.

Nothing itself, would it not be preferable to that mul-

Digitized by Google

titude of existences formed to be continually dissolved; those tribes of animals born and reproduced to devour others, and be devoured in their turn; those numberless beings endued with sensation, and formed to experience so many sensations of pain; and those other tribes of reasoning beings which never, or at least only rarely, listen to reason? For what purpose, Nature, was all this?

NATURE.

Oh! pray go and inquire of him who made me.

NECESSARY—NECESSITY.

OSMIN.

Do you not assert that everything is necessary?

SELIM.

If all be not necessary, it follows that God does unnecessary things.

OSMIN.

That is to say, it was necessary for the divine nature to do what it has done.

SELIM.

I believe, or at least I suspect so. There are men who think differently. I do not understand them; but possibly they are right. I fear to dispute on this subject.

OSMIN.

It is however necessary for me to talk to you upon it.

SELIM.

In what manner? Would you speak of what is necessary to sustain life, or the evil to which people are reduced who cannot procure it?

OSMIN.

No; for that which is necessary to one is not always necessary to another. It is necessary for an Indian to possess rice, for an Englishman to eat animal food, as Russians must wear furs, and Africans gauze. One man believes that he has need of a dozen coach-horses,

Digitized by Google

another limits himself to a pair of shoes, and a third walks gaily on his bare feet. I wish to speak to you of that which is necessary to all men.

SELIM.

It appears to me that God has given us all that is necessary in this sense: eyes to see, feet to walk, a mouth to eat, a gullet to swallow, a stomach to digest, a brain to reason, and organs to produce our kind.

OSMIN.

How happens it then that men are sometimes born who are deprived of a part of these necessary faculties?

SELIM.

Because the general laws of nature are liable to accidents which produce monsters; but in general man is provided with all things necessary to his existence in society.

OSMIN.

Are there not notions common to all men necesary to this purpose?

SELIM.

Yes; I have travelled with Paul Lucas, and wherever I went I saw, that man respected his father and his mother; that he thought himself bound to keep his promise; that he pitied oppressed innocence; that he detested persecution; that he regarded freedom of thinking as a right of nature, and the enemies of that freedom as the enemies of the human race. They who think differently appear to me to be badly organised, and monsters, like those who are born without eyes or heads.

OSMIN.

These necessary things—are they necessary in all times, and in all places?

SELIM.

Yes: otherwise they would not be necessary to human kind.

OSMIN.

Therefore a new creed is not necessary to mankind. Men could live in society, and perform all their duties towards God, before they believed that Mahomet had frequent conversations with the angel Gabriel.

Digitized by Google

SELIM.

Nothing is more evident: it would be ridiculous to think, that man could not perform his duties until Mahomet came into the world. It was no way necessary for men to believe the Koran. The world went on before the appearance of Mahomet, precisely as at present. If Mahometanism was necessary to the world, it would exist everywhere. God, who has given us two eyes to see the sun, would have bestowed upon us some means of discovering the truth of the Mahometan religion. That sect therefore resembles the arbitrary laws which change according to times and places, like fashions or the theories of physicians, which displace and succeed one another. The Mahometan religion cannot therefore be essentially necessary to man.

OSMIN.

But since it exists, God has permitted it.

SELIM.

Yes, as he permits all the world to abound in absurdities, errors, and calamities. This is not saying that men were absolutely created in order to be foolish and unhappy. God permits some men to be eaten by serpents, but we ought not to say, God made man to be eaten by serpents.

OSMIN.

What do you mean by saying God permits? Can anything happen but by his orders? To permit and to will—are they not with him the same thing?

SELIM.

He permits crime, but does not commit it.

OSMIN.

To commit a crime is to act against divine justice—to disobey God. Therefore, as God cannot disobey himself, he cannot commit crime; but he has so made man, that man commits it frequently. How does that arise?

SELIM.

Some men can tell, but I am not one of them. All that I know is, that the Koran is ridiculous, although possessing here and there things which are passable.

Digitized by Google

The Koran however is certainly not necessary to man—that I maintain. I perceive clearly that which is false, but know very little of that which is true.

OSMIN.

I thought that you would instruct me, but you teach me nothing.

SELIM.

Is it not something to know the men who deceive you, and the gross and dangerous errors they promulgate?

OSMIN.

I should have cause to complain of a physician who made me acquainted with poisonous plants, without instructing me in regard to such as are salutary.

SELIM.

I am no physician, nor are you a sick man; and it appears to me that I give you a very useful prescription, when I say to you,—Distrust the inventions of charlatans; worship God; be an honest man; and believe that two and two make four.

NEW—NOVELTIES.

It seems as if the first words of Ovid's Metamorphoses—'In nova fert animus'—were the emblem of mankind. No one is touched with the admirable spectacle of the sun which rises, or seems to rise every day; but every body runs at the smallest meteor which appears for a moment in the map of vapours which surround the earth, and which we call heaven. We despise whatever is common, or which has been long known:

> Vilia sunt nobis quæcumque prioribus annis
> Vidimus, et sordet quidquid spectavimus olim.

A hawker will not burthen himself with a Virgil or a Horace, but with a new book, were it ever so detestable. He draws you aside and says to you, Sir, will you have some books from Holland?

From the commencement of the world, women have complained of the infidelities done to them in favour of the first new object which presents itself, and which has often this novelty for its only merit. Several

Digitized by Google

ladies (we must confess it, notwithstanding the infinite respect which we have for them) have treated men as they complain that the men have treated them; and the story of Jocondo is much more ancient than Ariosto.

Perhaps this universal taste for novelty is a benefit of nature. We are told, Content yourselves with what you have—desire nothing beyond your situation—subdue the restlessness of your mind. These are very good maxims; but if we had followed them, we should still live upon acorns and sleep under the stars, and we should have had neither Corneille, Racine, Molière, Poussin, Le Brun, Le Moine, nor Pigal.

NEWTON AND DESCARTES.

SECTION I.

It must be acknowledged that these two great men were exceedingly different from each other in their conduct, their fortune, and their philosophy. Descartes was born with a brilliant and powerful imagination, which made him a singular man in his private life as well as in his manner of reasoning. This imagination was apparent even in his philosophical productions, which in every page abound in striking comparisons and illustrations. Nature had nearly made him a poet; and he actually composed for the queen of Sweden a dramatic entertainment, which, to the advantage of his fame, was never printed. He engaged for a time in the profession of arms; and, even after he had devoted himself to philosophy, he did not think it unworthy of him to make love. The mistress of his affections was called Francine, who died young; and her loss he sincerely and tenderly regretted. He thus experienced all that appertains to humanity.

He for a long time deemed it expedient to seclude himself from mankind, and especially from his own country, in order to philosophize at perfect liberty. In this he acted wisely. The men of his own times were too ignorant to be able to communicate to him any knowledge, and were capable only of doing him injury. He quitted France, because he sought for

Digitized by Google

truth, which was at that time persecuted by the wretched philosophy of the schools; but he did not find reason more prevalent in the universities of Holland, which he chose for his retreat; for at the very time when the only propositions of his philosophy that were true were condemned in France, he was also persecuted by the pretended philosophers of Holland, who understood him no better than those in his own country, and who, as they saw his glory more nearly, hated his person more bitterly. He was obliged to leave Utrecht; he even experienced the accusation of atheism, that last resource of calumniators; and the man who had devoted all the accuteness of his extraordinary intellect to the discovery of new proofs of the existence of a God, was most absurdly charged with denying him altogether. The various persecutions he sustained implied extraordinary merit and distinguished reputation, both of which he actually possessed. Athwart the profound darkness of the schools, and the prejudices of popular superstition, a ray of reason pervaded the world. His name at length obtained such celebrity, that rewards were held out to him with a view to his residence in France. He was offered a pension of a thousand crowns. He returned in the expectation of this allowance; but after being at the expence of paying for the patent (for patents were at that time not given, but purchased) he never received his pension, and returned to philosophize in his solitude of North Holland, at the time when the great Galileo, at the age of eighty years, was languishing out his life in the prisons of the Inquisition, for having demonstrated the motion of the earth. He at length died prematurely at Stockholm, in consequence of an improper regimen, amidst a number of learned men who were hostile to his opinions or envious of his celebrity, and under the superintendence of a physician who hated him.

The career of Sir Isaac Newton was widely different. He lived to the great age of eighty-four years, always peaceful, happy, and honoured by his country. It was his great good fortune, not merely to be born in a free

Digitized by Google

country, but at a period when the absurdities of the schools were banished, and reason alone was cultivated; the world could become only his scholar, and not his enemy.

One point in which he may be strikingly contrasted with Descartes is, that in the course of so prolonged a life he felt neither passion nor weakness. He never once associated as man with women, which was expressly stated to me by the physician and surgeon in whose presence, if not in whose arms, he expired.* Newton may for this excite our admiration, yet Descartes ought not to incur our censure.

The prevailing public opinion in England respecting these two philosophers is, that Descartes was a visionary and Newton a sage. Very few persons in London read Descartes, whose works have in fact become totally useless. Newton also has very few readers, because it requires great knowledge and sense to understand him. Every body however talks about them. No merit is allowed to the Frenchman, and every merit is ascribed to the Englishman. There are some who think that the destruction of the old and once universally received doctrine of nature's abhorring a 'vacuum;' that our knowledge of the gravity of the atmosphere; that the discovery of telescopes;—are all to be attributed to Newton: he resembles in this respect Hercules in the fable, to whom the ignorant gave the glory of achievments actually performed by other heroes.

In a critical examination written at London, of the discourse of M. de Fontenelle, the author ventures to assert, that Descartes was not a great geometrician. Those who use this language may well be reproached

* This proves that Newton's physician was not so good a natural philosopher as himself. There is no unequivocal proof of such abstinence in man; and a man who dies at the age of eighty-four, whose mind was calm and regulated, and who lived a retired and studious life, may possibly nevertheless have had his weaknesses, although there may be no living witnesses to attest them. Besides, even if Newton had in fact been perfectly unacquainted with the enjoyments in question, what benefit could possibly have resulted from it to mankind?—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

with ingratitude to their benefactor. Descartes constructed as noble a road of science, from the point at which he found geometry to that to which he carried it, as Newton himself did after him. He is the first who taught the way to find the algebraical equations of curves. His geometry, thanks to his powerful and inventive mind, although now become common and familiar, was in his own time so profound, that no professor ventured to undertake the task of explaining it, and that there was not a man besides Schultens in Holland, and Fermat in France, who really comprehended it. He carried this spirit of geometry and invention into optics, which under him became a completely new art; and if, notwithstanding this, he was in some respects entirely mistaken, it is to be remembered that the discoverer of new lands cannot instantly become acqainted with all their various productions and qualities. Those who came after him owe him some obligation at least, simply for the discovery. I will not deny that all the other works of Descartes abound in errors.

Geometry was a guide which he had in some degree discovered himself, and which would have conducted him safely through his physical researches; he however at last abandoned this guide, and gave himself up to the spirit of system. From that time his philosophy became nothing more that an ingenious romance, and at most only probable even to the ignorant philosophers of the day. He was mistaken on the nature of the soul, on the laws of motion, on the nature of light. He admitted the doctrine of innate ideas; he invented new elements; he created a world; he made man on his own peculiar system; and it was truly said, that Descartes's man was a very different being from the real man. He carried his metaphysical errors so far as to maintain that two and two make four, because it is the will of God they should do so; but notwithsanding all this, it is not going beyond the bound of truth to say, that he was estimable and respectable even in his very errors. He was mistaken, but he was at least methodically, consistently, and we may almost say, ration-

Digitized by Google

ally mistaken. If he invented new chimeras in physics, he at least had the merit of destroying old ones. He taught his contemporaries the way to reason, and how to turn his own weapons against himself. If he did not pay in good sterling money, he at least cried down what was false.

Descartes gave an eye to the blind; they saw both the faults of antiquity and of himself; the road opened by him has since become immense. The little work of Rohault constituted at one period, what was deemed a complete system of natural philosophy; at present, all the collections of the academies of Europe cannot be considered even as the commencement of a system. In attempting to fathom this abyss, we discover infinity.

SECTION II.

Newton was at first intended for the church. He began with being a theologian, and evident marks of his early disposition and studies remained with him through life. He decidedly adopted the Arian, in opposition to the Athanasian system. He even went somewhat farther than Arius, as do all the Socinians. There are in Europe, at present, many learned men of this opinion; I do not say of this communion, for they do not constitute an organized and incorporated association. They are indeed divided by considerable shades of difference among themselves, and many among them reduce their system to simple deism, with the superaddition of christian morality. Newton was not one of this latter description. He differed from the Anglican church only on the point of consubstantiality, and was a firm believer in everything besides.

One proof of his sincerity is, his commentary upon the Apocalypse. He discovers in that book that the pope is antichrist, and he explains it also in other respects, like all those who have undertaken the task of interpreting it. It would seem to have been his intention, by this commentary, to console the human race for his individual superiority.

Many who have read the little that Newton wrote on metaphysical subjects, which he has introduced

Digitized by Google

at the close of his "Principia," have found it quite as obscure as the Apocalypse itself. Metaphysicians and divines may not unaptly be compared to that class of gladiators who were compelled to fight with a bandage over their eyes. But when Newton applied himself with his eyes open to mathematical researches, his views extended to the limits of the world.

He invented what is called the calculation of infinitesimals; he discovered and demonstrated a new principle which produces motion in all nature. Before him men were unacquainted with the nature of light. False or confused notions were universally entertained concerning it. He said, Let light be known, and it was so.

He was the inventor of reflecting telescopes. The first was made by his own hands; and he has clearly shown why the power or reach of the common telescope cannot be increased. It was in relation to his new telescope, that a German jesuit mistook Newton for a journeyman optician; he calls him "an artisan of the name of Newton." Posterity has well avenged him. He was however treated with more injustice still in France: he was considered as an unsuccessful and mistaken experimentalist; and because Mariotte made use of bad prisms, the discoveries of Newton were rejected.

He was admired by his countrymen as soon as ever his writings and experiments were known. He was not well known in France until after the expiration of forty years. By way of compensation however for this long period of ignorance, we had the tubular matter and the ramified matter of Descartes, and the little flimsy vortices of the reverend father Malebranche, and the system of M. Privat de Molière—who however, it must be admitted, was not quite equal to Poquelin de Molière.

Of all the persons who have lived in society with cardinal de Polignac, although upon the most slender footing, there is not a man who has not heard him say, that Newton was a peripatetic; and that his colorific rays, and more particularly his attraction, savoured

Digitized by Google

strongly of atheism. Cardinal de Polignac united to all the advantages he had received from nature, very impressive and commanding eloquence, and he made Latin verses with a facility and a success that were astonishing; but he knew nothing of philosophy beyond that of Descartes, and he retained by heart his reasonings just as we are in the habit of retaining dates. He had not become a geometrician, and he was not born a philosopher; he was a competent judge of Cicero's Orations against Catiline or of Virgil's Æneid, but not of Newton and Locke.

When we reflect that Newton, Locke, Clarke, and Leibnitz, would have been persecuted in France, imprisoned at Rome, and burnt at Lisbon, what are we to think of human reason? Happily, she was by this time born in England. In the time of queen Mary, an active and bitter persecution had been carried on respecting the manner of pronouncing Greek; and the persecutors were the party that happened to be mistaken. Those who enjoined penance upon Galileo were more mistaken still. Every inquisitor ought to be overwhelmed by a feeling of shame in the deepest recesses of his soul at the very sight of one of the spheres of Copernicus. Yet if Newton had been born in Portugal, and any dominican had discovered a heresy in his inverse ratio of the squares of the distances, he would without hesitation have been clothed in a 'san-benito,' and burnt as a sacrifice acceptable to God at an 'auto-da-fé.'*

It has frequently been asked, how it happens that those who by their profession are bound to obtain knowledge and show indulgence, have so frequently been, on the contrary, ignorant and unrelenting. They have been ignorant, because they had long studied; and they have been cruel, because they perceived that their ill-chosen studies were objects of contempt to the truly discerning and wise. The inquisitors who had

* This is as true in fact, as piquant in description; and although san-benitos and autos-da-fé are out of fashion, the disposition to persecute and run down abstract truths is nearly as strong as ever.—T.

Digitized by Google

the hardihood to condemn the system of Copernicus, not merely as heretical, but as absurd, had certainly nothing to apprehend from that system. The earth, as well as the other planets, could move round the sun without their sustaining any loss of revenues or of honour. A dogma is always secure enough when it is assailed only by philosophers. All the academies in the world will produce no change in the creed of the common people. What then is the foundation of that rage which has so often exasperated an Anitus against a Socrates? It is, that Anitus in the bottom of his heart says—Socrates despises me.

When young, I entertained the idea that Newton had made his fortune by his extreme merit. I imagined that the court and city of London had promoted him, as it were by acclamation, to be grand master of the Mint. Nothing was ever less true. Isaac Newton had a very lovely niece, who happened to please the lord high treasurer Halifax. His calculation of infinitesimals, and his discovery of gravitation, would have been of no service to him without his handsome niece.

SECTION III.

Of the reformed Chronology of Newton, which reduces the Age of the World five hundred years.

I have still to speak of another work, more within the comprehension of mankind in general, but which at the same time is distinguished by that creative mind which Sir Isaac Newton carrried with him into all his researches. This is a perfectly new chronology; for in everything that he undertook he appears to have been destined to change the ideas which had been adopted by other men. Accustomed as he was to reduce chaos to order, he endeavoured to shed at least some light on the chaos of ancient fable and history, and to fix a chronology before exceedingly doubtful. It is incontestable, that no family, city, or nation ever existed, that was not desirous of placing its origin as far back in antiquity as possible. The earliest histo-

Digitized by Google

rians, moreover, are the most careless with respect to dates. Books being infinitely less common than at present, and consequently incalculably less exposed to criticism and detection, mankind were deceived by authors almost with impunity; and as facts have evidently been fabricated, it can scarcely be doubted that dates have likewise been so. On a general view, Sir Isaac Newton considered the world five hundred years younger than chronologists supposed. He founds this conclusion on the usual course of nature, and also upon astronomical observations.

By the course of nature is here meant the average number of years allowed to the successive generations of mankind. The Egyptians were the first who adopted this uncertain method of computation, when they were desirous of recording the early events of their history. They reckoned three hundred and forty-one generations from Menes to Sethon; and as they had no fixed dates, they considered three generations as equivalent to a hundred years. Accordingly, from the reign of Menes to that of Sethon, they reckoned eleven thousand three hundred and forty years. The Greeks, before they adopted the system of the Olympiads, followed the same method as the Egyptians, and extended farther the duration of generations, carrying each to the length of forty years. In this point, however, both Egyptians and Greeks were mistaken in their calculation. It is perfectly true that, according to the usual course of nature, three generations would extend to about a hundred and twenty years; but it is very far indeed from being true, that three reigns would comprise that number of years. It is perfectly evident in general, that men live a much longer time than kings reign. Accordingly, a man desirous of writing the history of any country, but who had no access to correct dates, who knew however that there were nine kings who had reigned over it, would commit one of the grossest of errors in computing these nine reigns as extending to three hundred years. Every generation is about thirty years, every reign is about twenty, one with another, or, according to the common expression,

Digitized by Google

on the average. Take, for example, the thirty kings of England, from William the Conqueror to George I. and we shall find they reigned, on the whole, six hundred and forty-eight years; which amount, divided by thirty, will give to each individual reign twenty-one years and a half. Sixty-three kings of France reigned each, upon the average, about twenty years. Such is the ordinary course of nature. The ancients therefore were mistaken in equalizing the duration of three reigns to that of three generations; they allowed too long an average duration to a reign; and their allowance therefore must be proportionally reduced.

Astronomical observations seem to furnish our philosopher with more powerful and decisive support. He appears strongest when contending on his own territory. We know that the earth, besides its annual movement, which carries it round the sun from west to east in the space of a year, has a farther and singular revolution, rather suspected than ascertained until very modern times. Its poles have a very slow retrograde motion from east to west, the consequence of which is, that every day their position does not correspond precisely to the same point of the heavens as it did the day before. This difference, which is imperceptible in a single year, becomes very distinguishable and striking in time; and at the end of seventy-two years, the difference is found to amount to a degree, that is, the three hundred and sixtieth part of the whole circle of the heavens. Thus, after seventy-two years, the colure of the vernal equinox, which previously to the commencement of that period passed through one fixed star, corresponds to another fixed star one degree distant from the former. Hence it arises that the sun, instead of being in that part of the heavens where the ram was in the time of Hipparchus, is found to correspond now to that part of them in which the fishes are placed; and that the twins are now where the bull was then. All the signs have changed place; but notwithstanding this change, we still use the same language as the ancients in speaking of them. We say, the sun is in the ram in spring, accommodating our

Digitized by Google

language to natural appearances, in the same manner as when we say, the sun revolves from east to west.

Hipparchus was the first among the Greeks who perceived any change in the constellations in reference to the equinoxes, or rather who learnt it from the Egyptians. The philosophers attributed this motion to the stars; for at that time no one suspected such a revolution in our earth. That was thought in every sense immoveable. They therefore created the heavens, to which they attached all the stars, and attributed to these heavens a particular motion which made them advance towards the east, while all the stars appeared to take their daily course from east to west. To this error they added another, of much more consequence. They imagined that the pretended heavens of fixed stars advanced one degree towards the east in a hundred years. Thus they were mistaken in their astronomical calculation, as well as in their system of natural philosophy. For example: an astronomer of that period would have said, The vernal equinox, at the time of a certain observer, was in such a sign, and at such a particular star; it has moved two degrees from the time of that observer to our own; but two degrees are equivalent to two hundred years; that observer therefore lived two hundred years before me. It is certain, that an astronomer who had proceeded upon such calculations would have been mistaken by about fifty years. It was on this account that the ancients, thus doubly deceived, composed their great year of the world, that is to say, of the revolution of the whole heavens, of about thirty-six thousand years. But the moderns know that this imaginary revolution of the heaven of stars is nothing but the revolution of the poles of the earth, which is accomplished in twenty-five thousand nine hundred years. It is proper to remark as we proceed, that Sir Isaac Newton, in determining the figure of the earth, has very ingeniously and successfully explained the reason of this revolution.

These premises being admitted, it remains, in order to settle chronology, to ascertain through what star the equinoctial colure divides the ecliptic in spring, at

Digitized by Google

present, and to try to discover whether some ancient writer or other does not inform us in what point the ecliptic was divided by that colure in his time. Clement of Alexandria relates, that Chiron, who belonged to the expedition of the Argonauts, observed the constellations at the period of that celebrated expedition, and fixed the vernal equinox in the middle of the ram, the autumnal equinox in the middle of the scales, and the solstice of our summer in the middle of Capricorn.

Long after the expedition of the Argonauts, and one year before the Peloponnesian war, Meton observed, that the point of the summer solstice passed through the sixth degree of Cancer.

But every sign of the zodiac consists of thirty degrees. In Chiron's time the solstice was half-way in the sign, that is, at the fifteenth degree; a year before the Peloponnesian war, it was at the eighth; it had therefore retrograded seven degrees—(a degree is equivalent to seventy-two years); therefore, from the beginning of the Peloponnesian war to the expedition of the Argonauts, there were no more than seven times seventy-two years, which the Greeks state to have been in fact the case. Thus, comparing the state of the heavens at present with the state in which they were at that time, we perceive that the Argonautic expedition ought to be placed nine hundred years before Jesus Christ, and not about fourteen hundred; and that consequently the world is not so old as was imagined by about five hundred years. By this mode of computation all events are brought nearer to each other, and every historical fact took place at a later period than it was stated to do. This system appears to be correct; I am unable to state how far it will succeed, and whether men will be induced to reform the chronology of the world upon the principles here explained. Perhaps the learned might consider it too much to concede to one individual the glory of having perfected at once natural philosophy, geometry, and history; this would be admitting a species of universal monarchy, which self-love can scarcely allow without great reluctance. Accordingly, at the time that the

Digitized by Google

partizans of 'vortices' and tabular matter attacked the demonstrated doctrine of gravitation, the reverend fathers Souciet and Freret wrote against the chronology of Newton, even before it appeared from the press.

NUDITY.

Why do we shut up a man or a woman whom we find naked in the streets? and why is no one offended at entirely naked statues, and with certain paintings of Jesus and of Magdalen which are to be seen in some of the churches?

It is very likely that human beings existed for a considerable time without clothing.

In more than one island and on the continent of America, people are still found who are ignorant of clothing.

The most civilized of them conceal the organs of generation by leaves, by interlaced rushes or mats, and by feathers.

Whence this latter modesty? Is it the instinct of nature to provoke desire by the concealment of that which we are inclined to discover?

Is it true that among nations somewhat more polished than the Jews and demi-Jews, there are entire sects who, when they worship God, deprive themselves of clothing. Such have been, it is said, the Adamites and the Abeliens. They assembled together, naked, to sing the praises of God. St. Epiphanius and St. Augustin say this, who, it is true, were not contemporaries, and who lived very distant from their country. But after all, this folly is possible, and is not more extraordinary or insane than a hundred other follies which have made the tour of the world, one after another.

We have seen, in the article Emblem, that the Mahometans still possess saints who are mad, and who go about naked as apes. It is very possible that crazy people have existed, who thought that it was more proper to present ourselves before the deity in the state in which he has formed us, than under any disguise of

Digitized by Google

our own invention. It is possible that these persons exposed themselves out of pure devotion. There are so few well-made people of either sex, that nudity may have inspired chastity, or rather disgust, instead of augmenting desire.

It is moreover asserted, that the Abeliens renounced marriage. If they abounded in youthful gallants and amorous maidens, they were the less comparable with St. Adhelm and the happy Robert D'Arbrisselle, who lay with the most beautiful women, only in order to prove the strength of their continence.

I confess however, that it must be pleasant to witness a hundred naked Helens and Parises singing anthems, giving one another the kiss of peace, and performing the ceremonies of the agapæ.

All this proves, that there is nothing so singular, so extravagant, or so superstitious, which has not been conceived by the head of man. Happy it is, when these follies do not trouble society, and make of it a scene of hate, of discord, and of fury. It is doubtless better to pray to God stark naked, than to soil his altars and the public places with human blood.

NUMBER.

Was Euclid right in defining number to be a collection of unities of the same kind?

When Newton says, that number is an abstract relation of one quantity to another of the same kind, does he not understand by that the use of numbers in arithmetic and geometry?

Wolfe says, number is that which has the same relation with unity as one right line has with another. Is not this rather a property attributed to a number, than a definition?

If I dared, I would simply define numbers the idea of several unities.

I see white—I have a sensation, an idea of white. It signifies not whether these two things are or are not of the same species; I can reckon two ideas. I see four men and four horses—I have the idea of eight; in like

Digitized by Google

manner, three stones and six trees will give me the idea of nine.

That I add, multiply, subtract, and divide these, are operations of the faculty of thought which I have received from the master of nature; but they are not properties inherent to number. I can square three and cube it, but there is not certainly in nature any number which can be squared or cubed.

I very well conceive what an odd or even number is, but I can never conceive either a perfect or an imperfect one.

Numbers can have nothing by themselves. What properties, what virtue, can ten flints, ten trees, ten ideas, possess merely because they are ten? What superiority will one number divisible in three even parts have over another divisible in two?

Pythagoras was the first, it is said, who discovered divine virtues in numbers. I doubt whether he was the first; for he had travelled in Egypt, Babylon, and India, and must have related much of their arts and knowledge. The Indians particularly, the inventors of the combined and complicated game of chess, and of cyphers so convenient that the Arabs learned of them, through whom they have been communicated to us after so many ages,—these same Indians, I say, joined strange chimeras to their sciences. The Chaldeans had still more, and the Egyptians more still. We know that self-delusion is in our nature. Happy is he who can preserve himself from it! Happy is he who, after having some access of this fever of the mind can recover tolerable health.

Porphyrius, in the Life of Pythagoras, says that the number 2 is fatal. We might say, on the contrary, that it is the most favourable of all. Woe to him that is always single! Woe to nature, if the human species and that of animals were not often two and two!

If 2 was of bad augury, 3, by way of recompense, was admirable, and 4 was divine; but the Pythagoreans and their imitators forgot that this mysterious 4, so divine, was composed of twice that diabolical number 2! Six had its merit, because the first statuari-

Digitized by Google

divided their figures into six modules. We have seen that, according to the Chaldeans, God created the world in six *gahambars*; but 7 was the most marvellous number; for there were at first but seven planets, each planet had its heaven, and that made seven heavens, without any one knowing what was meant by the word 'heaven.' All Asia reckoned seven days for a week. We divide the life of man into seven ages. How many reasons have we in favour of this number!

The Jews in time collected some scraps of this philosophy. It passed among the first christians of Alexandria with the dogmas of Plato. It is principally displayed in the Apocalypse of Cerinthus, attributed to John the Apostle.

We see a striking example of it in the number of the beast:—*

"That no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six." †

We know what great pains all the great scholars have taken to divine the solution of this enigma. This number, composed of three times two at each figure, does it signify three times fatal to the third power? There were two beasts, and we know not yet of which the author would speak.

We have seen that Bossuet, less happy in arithmetic than in funeral orations, has demonstrated that Dioclesian is the beast, because we find the Roman figures 666 in the letters of his name, by cutting off those which would spoil this operation. But in making use of Roman figures, he does not remember that the Apocalypse was written in Greek. An eloquent man may fall into this mistake.

---

* Apocalypse, xiii. 17, 18.

† This passage may serve to discover the time in which the Apocalypse was composed. It is probable that it was under the empire of the tyrant whose name is formed by letters answering to the numeral value of 666. From this we find that it was written in the reign of Caligula.

Digitized by Google

The power of numbers was much more respected among us when we knew nothing about them.

You may observe, my dear reader, in the article FIGURE, some fine allegories that Augustin, bishop of Hippo, extracted from numbers.

This taste subsisted so long, that it triumphed at the Council of Trent. We preserve its mysteries, called 'Sacraments' in the Latin church, because the dominicans, and Soto at their head, allege that there are seven things which contribute to life, seven planets, seven virtues, seven mortal sins, six days of creation and one of repose, which makes seven; further, seven plagues of Egypt, seven beatitudes; but unfortunately the fathers forget that Exodus reckons ten plagues, and that the beatitudes are to the number of eight in St. Matthew and four in St. Luke. But scholars have overcome this difficulty; by retrenching from St. Matthew the four beatitudes of St. Luke, there remain six, and add unity to these six, and you will have seven. Consult Fra Paolo Sarpi, in the second book of his history of the Council of Trent.

NUMBERING.

SECTION I.

THE most ancient numberings that history has left us are those of the Israelites, which are indubitable, since they are extracted from the Jewish books.

We believe that we must not reckon as a numbering the flight of the Israelites to the number of six hundred thousand men on foot, because the text specifies them not tribe by tribe;* it adds, that an innumerable troop of people gathered together and joined them. This is only a relation.

The first circumstantial numbering is that which we see in the book of the 'Viedaber,' which we call Numbers.† By the reckoning which Moses and Aaron made of the people in the desert, we find, in counting

* Exodus xii. 37, 38. † Numbers i.

Digitized by Google

all the tribes except that of Levi, six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty men capable of bearing arms; and if we add the tribe of Levi, supposing it equal in number to the others, the strong with the weak, we shall have six hundred and fifty-three thousand nine hundred and thirty-five men, to which we must add an equal number of old women and children, which will compose two millions six hundred and fifteen thousand seven hundred and forty-two persons, who departed from Egypt.

When David, after the example of Moses, ordered the numbering of all the people,* he found eight hundred thousand warriors of the tribes of Israel, and five hundred thousand of that of Judah, according to the book of Kings; but according to Chronicles† they reckoned eleven hundred thousand warriors in Israel, and less than five hundred thousand in Judah.

The book of Kings formally excludes Levi and Benjamin, and counts them not. If therefore we join these two tribes to the others in their proportion, the total of the warriors will amount to nineteen hundred and twenty thousand. This is a great number for the little country of Judea, the half of which is composed of frightful rocks and caverns: but it was a miracle.

It is not for us to enter into the reasons for which the sovereign arbiter of kings and people punished David for an operation which he himself commanded to Moses. It still less becomes us to seek why God, being irritated against David, punished the people for being numbered. The prophet Gad ordered the king on the part of God to choose war, famine, or pestilence. David accepted the pestilence, and seventy thousand Jews died of it in three days.

St. Ambrosius in his book of Repentance, and St. Augustin in his book against Faustus, acknowledged that pride and ambition led David to make this calculation. Their opinion is of great weight, and we can certainly submit to their decision by extinguishing all the deceitful lights of our own minds.

---

* 1 Kings xxiv. † 1 Chronicles xxi. 5.

Digitized by Google

Scripture relates a new numbering in the time of Esdras,* when the Jewish nation returned from captivity. "All this multitude (say equally Esdras and Nehemiah,† being as one man) amounted to forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty persons." They were all named by families, and they counted the number of Jews of each family, and the number of priests. But in these two authors there are not only differences between the numbers and the names of families, but we further see an error of calculation in both. By the calculation of Esdras, instead of forty-two thousand men, after computation we find but twenty-nine thousand eight hundred and eighteen; and by that of Nehemiah we find thirty-one thousand and eighty-nine.

We must consult the commentators on this apparent mistake, particularly Dom Calmet, who adding to one of these calculations what is wanting to the other, and further adding what is wanted to both of them, solves all the difficulty. To the computations of Esdras and Nehemiah, as reckoned by Calmet, are wanting ten thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven persons; but we find them in families which could not give their genealogy; besides, if there were any fault of the copyist, it could not destroy the veracity of the divinely inspired text.

It is to be believed, that the great neighbouring kings of Palestine made numberings of their people as frequently as possible. Herodotus gives us the amount of all those who followed Xerxes,‡ without including his naval forces. He reckons seventeen hundred thousand men, and he pretends, that to arrive at this computation, they were sent in divisions of ten thousand into a place which would only hold this number of men closely crowded. This method is very faulty, for by crowding a little less, each division of ten thousand might easily contain only from eight to nine. Further, this method is not at all soldier-like, and it would have

* 1 Esdras ii. 64.
† 2 Esdras, which is the history of Nehemiah, vii. 66.
‡ Herodotus, book vii.

Digitized by Google

been much more easy to have counted the whole by making the soldiers march in rank and file.

It should further be observed, how difficult it was to support seventeen hundred thousand men in the country of Greece, which they went to conquer. We may very well doubt of this number, and the manner of reckoning it; of the whipping given to the Hellespont; and of the sacrifice of a thousand oxen made to Minerva by a Persian king, who knew her not, and who adored the sun alone as the only emblem of the Divinity. Besides, the numbering of seventeen hundred thousand men is not complete, even by the confession of Herodotus, since Xerxes further carried with him all the people of Thrace and Macedonia, whom he forced, he says, to follow him, apparently the sooner to starve his army. We should therefore do here what all wise men do in reading ancient, and even modern histories—suspend our judgment and doubt much.

The first numbering which we have of a profane nation, is that made by Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome. He found, says Titus Livius, eighty thousand combatants, all Roman citizens: that implies three hundred and twenty thousand citizens at least, as many old people, women and children, to which we must add at least twenty thousand domestics, slaves and freemen.

Now we may reasonably doubt whether the little Roman state contained this number. Romulus only reigned (if we may call him king) over about three thousand bandits, assembled in a little town between the mountains. This town was the worst land of Italy. The circuit of all his country was not three thousand paces. Servius was the sixth chief or king of this rising people. The rule of Newton, which is indubitable for elective kingdoms, gives twenty-one years' reign to each king, and by that contradicts all the ancient historians, who have never observed the order of time, nor given any precise date. The five kings of Rome must have reigned about a hundred years.

It is certainly not in the order of nature that an

Digitized by Google

ungrateful soil, which was not five leagues in length or three in breadth, and which must have lost many of its inhabitants in its almost continual little wars, could be peopled with three hundred and forty thousand souls. There is not half the number in the same territory at present, when Rome is the metropolis of the christian world; when the affluence of foreigners and the ambassadors of so many nations must serve to people the towns; when gold flows from Poland, Hungary, half of Germany, Spain, and France, by a thousand channels into the purse of the Treasury, and must further facilitate population, if other causes intercept it.

As the history of Rome was not written until more than five hundred years after its foundation, it would not be at all surprising if the historians had liberally given Servius Tullius eighty thousand warriors instead of eight thousand, through false zeal for their country. Their zeal would have been much more judicious if they had confessed the weak commencement of their republic. It is much more noble to be raised from so poor an origin to so much greatness, than to have had double the soldiers of Alexander to conquer about fifteen leagues of country in four hundred years.

The census was never taken except of Roman citizens. It is pretended, that under Augustus it amounted to four millions one hundred and thirty-seven thousand, in the year 29 before our vulgar era, according to Tillemont, who is very exact, and Dion Cassius, who is no less so.

Lawrence Echard admits but one numbering, of four millions one hundred and thirty-seven thousand men, in the year 14 of our era. The same Echard speaks of a general numbering of the empire for the first year of the same era; but he quotes no Roman author, nor specifies any calculation of the number of citizens. Tillemont speaks not in any way of this numbering.

We have quoted Tacitus and Suetonius, but to very little purpose. The census of which Suetonius speaks is not a numbering of citizens; it is only a list of those to whom the public furnished corn.

Digitized by Google

Tacitus only speaks, in book ii. of a census established among the Gauls, for the purpose of raising more tribute on each head. Augustus never made a calculation of the other subjects of his empire, because they paid not the poll-tax, which he wished to establish in Gaul.

Tacitus says,* that Augustus had a memoir, written in his own hand, which contained the revenues of the empire, the fleets and contributary kingdoms. He speaks not of any numbering.

Dion Cassius speaks of a census,† but he specifies no number.

Josephus in his Antiquities‡ says, that in the year 759 of Rome (the time answering to the eleventh year of our era) Cyrenius, then constituted governor of Syria, caused a list to be made of all the property of the Jews, which caused a revolt. This has no relation to a general numbering, and merely proves, that this Cyrenius was not governor of Judea (which was then a little province of Syria) until ten years after, and not at the birth of our Saviour.

These seem to me to be all the principal passages that we can collect in profane histories, touching the numberings attributed to Augustus. If we refer to them, Jesus Christ would be born under the government of Varus, and not under that of Cyrenius; and there could have been no universal numbering. But St. Luke, whose authority should prevail over that of Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, Dion Cassius, and all the writers of Rome,—St. Luke affirms positively, that there was an universal numbering of all the earth, and that Cyrenius was governor of Judea. We must therefore refer solely to him, without even seeking to reconcile him with Flavius Josephus, or with any other historian. As to the rest, neither the New nor the Old Testament have been given to us to enlighten points of history, but to announce salutary truths, before which all events and opinions should vanish. It is thus that we always reply to the false calculations,

* Annals, book i. † Book xliii. ‡ Josephus, book xviii.

Digitized by Google

contradictions, absurdities, enormous faults of geography, chronology, physics, and even common sense, with which philosophers tell us the holy scripture is filled: we cease not to reply, that there is here no question of reason, but of faith and piety.

SECTION II.

With regard to the numbers of the moderns, kings fear not at present that a doctor Gad should propose to them on the part of God, either famine, war, or pestilence, to punish them for wishing to know the amount of their subjects. None of them know it.

We conjecture and guess, and always possibly within a few millions of men.

I have carried the number of inhabitants which compose the empire of Russia to twenty-four millions, in the statements which have been sent to me; but I have not guaranteed this valuation, because I know very little about it. I believe that Germany possessed as many people, reckoning the Hungarians. If I am deceived by one or two millions, we know it is a trifle in such a case.

I beg pardon of the king of Spain, if I have only awarded him seven millions of subjects in our continent. It is a very small number; but Don Ustaris, employed in the ministry, gives him no more.

We reckon from about nine to ten millions of free beings in the three kingdoms of Great Britain.

In France we count between sixteen and twenty millions. This is a proof that doctor Gad has nothing wherewith to reproach the ministry of France.

As to the capital towns, opinions are further divided. According to some calculators, Paris has seven hundred thousand inhabitants, and according to others five hundred thousand. It is thus with London, Constantinople, and Grand Cairo.*

As to the subjects of the pope, they will make a crowd in paradise, but the multitude is moderate on earth.

* Hume ably follows Voltaire in this train of reasoning, and exposes the almost universal tendency of the ancients and half civilised countries to exaggerate in point of number.—T.

Digitized by Google

Why so?—because they are subjects of the pope. Would Cato the Censor have ever believed that the Romans would come to that pass.*

OCCULT QUALITIES.

Occult qualities have, for a very long time, been much derided: it would be more proper to deride those who do not believe in them. Let us for the hundredth time repeat, that every principle, every primitive source of any of the works which come from the hand of the demiourgos, is occult, and eternally hidden from mortals.

What is the centripetal force, the force of gravitation, which acts without contact at such immense distances?

What causes our hearts to beat sixty times a minute? What other power changes this grass into milk in the udder of a cow? and this bread into the flesh, blood, and bone of that child, who grows proportionally while he eats it, until he arrives at the height determined by nature, after which there is no art which can add a line to it.

Vegetables, minerals, animals, where is your originating principle? In the hands of him who turns the sun upon its axis, and who has clothed it with light.

This lead will never become silver, nor this silver gold; this gold will never become diamond, nor this straw be transformed into lemons and ananas.

What corpuscular system of physics, what atoms, determine their nature? You know nothing about it, and the cause will be eternally occult to you. All that surrounds us, all within us, is an enigma which it is not in the power of man to divine.

The furred ignoramus ought to have been aware of this truth when he said, that beasts possess a vegetative and sensitive soul, and man a soul which is vegetative, sensitive, and intellectual.

Poor man, kneaded up of pride, who hast pronounced only words—hast thou ever seen a soul? Knowest

* See Population.

Digitized by Google

thou how it is made? We have spoken much of the soul in these inquiries, but have always confessed our ignorance. I now repeat this confession still more emphatically, since the more I read, the more I meditate, and the more I acquire, the more am I enabled to affirm, that I know nothing.

OFFENCES (LOCAL).

If we travel throughout the whole earth, we still find that theft, murder, adultery, calumny, &c. are regarded as offences which society condemns and represses; but that which is approved in England and condemned in Italy, ought it to be punished in Italy, as if it were one of the crimes against general humanity? That which is a crime only in the precincts of some mountains, or between two rivers, demands it not from judges more indulgence than those outrages which are regarded with horror in all countries? Ought not the judge to say to himself, I should not dare to punish in Ragusa what I punish at Loretto? Should not this reflection soften his heart, and moderate the hardness which it is too apt to contract in the long exercise of his employment?

The 'Kermesses' of Flanders are well known: they were carried in the last century to a degree of indecency, revolting to the eyes of all persons, who were not accustomed to such spectacles.

The following is the manner in which Christmas is celebrated in some countries. In the first place appears a young man half-naked, with wings on his shoulders; he pronounces the Ave Maria to a young girl, who replies 'fiat,' and the angel kisses her on the mouth; after which a child, shut up in a great cock of pasteboard, imitates the crowing of the cock. "Puer natus est nobis." A great ox bellows out 'ubi;' a sheep baas out 'Bethlehem;' an ass brays 'hihanus,' to signify 'eamus;' and a long procession, preceded by four fools with bells and baubles, brings up the rear. There still remain some traces of this popular devotion,

Digitized by Google

which among a civilized and educated people would be taken for profanation. A Swiss out of patience, and possibly more intoxicated than the performers of the ox and the ass, took the liberty of remonstrating with them at Louvain, and was rewarded with no small number of blows; they would indeed have hanged him, and he escaped with great difficulty.

The same man had a dangerous quarrel at the Hague, for violently taking the part of Barnevelt against an outrageous Gomarist. He was imprisoned at Amsterdam, for saying that priests were the scourge of humanity, and the source of all our misfortunes. "How!" said he, "if we maintain that good works are necessary to salvation, we are sent to a dungeon; and if we laugh at a cock and an ass, we risk hanging!" Ridiculous as this adventure was, it is sufficient to convince us, that we may be criminal in one or two points in our hemisphere, and innocent in all the rest of the world.

ONAN.

The race of Onan exhibits great singularities. The patriarch Judah, his father, lay with his daughter-in-law Tamar the Phenician, in the high road; Jacob, the father of Judah, was at the same time married to two sisters, the daughters of an idolater; and deluded both his father and father-in-law. Lot, the grand uncle of Jacob, lay with his two daughters. Saleum, one of the descendants of Jacob and of Judah, espoused Rahab the Canaanite, a prostitute. Boaz, son of Saleum and Rahab, received into his bed Ruth the Midianite; and was great grand-father of David. David took away Bathsheba from the warrior Uriah, her husband, and caused him to be slain, that he might be unrestrained in his amour. Lastly, in the two genealogies of Christ, which differ in so many points, but agree in this; we discover that he descended from this tissue of fornication, adultery, and incest.

Nothing is more proper to confound human pru-

Digitized by Google

dence; to humble our limited minds; and to convince us that the ways of providence are not like our ways.

The reverend father Dom Calmet makes this reflection, in alluding to the incest of Judah with Tamar, and to the sin of Onan, spoken of in the 38th chapter of Genesis: "Scripture," he observes, "gives us the details of a history, which on the first perusal strikes our minds as not of a nature for edification; but the hidden sense which is shut up in it is as elevated, as that of the mere letter appears low to carnal eyes. It is not without good reasons that the Holy Spirit has allowed the histories of Tamar, of Rahab, of Ruth, and of Bathsheba, to form a part of the genealogy of Jesus Christ."

It might have been well if Dom Calmet had explained these sound reasons, by which we might have cleared up the doubts and appeased the scruples of all the honest and timorous souls who are anxious to comprehend how this Supreme Being, the Creator of worlds, could be born in a Jewish village, of a race of plunderers and of prostitutes. This mystery, which is not less inconceivable than other mysteries, was assuredly worthy the explanation of so able a commentator:—but to return to our subject.

We perfectly understand the crime of the patriarch Judah, and of the patriarchs Simeon and Levi, his brothers, at Sichem; but it is more difficult to understand the sin of Onan. Judah had married his eldest son Er to the Phenician Tamar. Er died in consequence of his wickedness, and the patriarch wished his second son to espouse the widow, according to an ancient law of the Egyptians and Phenicians, their neighbours, which was called raising up seed for his brother. The first child of this second marriage bore the name of the deceased, and this Onan objected to. He hated the memory of his brother, or to produce a child to bear the name of Er; and to avoid it took the means which are detailed in the chapter of Genesis already mentioned, and which are practised by no species of animals but apes and human beings.

Digitized by Google

An English physician wrote a small volume upon this vice, which he called after the name of the patriarch who was guilty of it. M. Tissot, the celebrated physician of Lausanne, also wrote on this subject, in a work much more profound and methodical than the English one. These two works detail the consequences of this unhappy habit—loss of strength, impotence, weakness of the stomach and intestines, tremblings, vertigo, lethargy, and often premature death.

M. Tissot, however, to console us for this evil, relates as many examples of the mischiefs of repletion in both sexes. There cannot be a stronger argument against rash vows of chastity. From the examples afforded, it is impossible to avoid being convinced of the enormous folly of condemning ourselves to these turpitudes in order to renounce a connexion which has been expressly commanded by God himself. In this manner think the Protestants, the Jews, the Mahometans, and many other nations; the Catholics offer other reasons in favour of converts. I shall merely say of the Catholics what Dom Calmet says of the Holy Ghost,—That their reasons are doubtless good, could we understand them.

OPINION.

What is the opinion of all the nations of the north of America, and those which border the Straits of Sunda, on the best of governments, and best of religions; on public ecclesiastical rights; on the manner of writing history; on the nature of tragedy, comedy, opera, eclogue, epic poetry; on innate ideas, concomitant grace, and the miracles of deacon Paris? It is clear, that all these people have no opinions on things of which they have no ideas.

They have a confused feeling of their customs, and go not beyond this instinct. Such are the people who inhabit the shores of the Frozen Sea for the space of fifteen hundred leagues. Such are the inhabitants of three parts of Africa, and those of nearly all the isles of Asia; of twenty hordes of Tartars, and almost

Digitized by Google

all men solely occupied with the painful and continual care of providing their subsistence. Such are, at two steps from us, most of the Morlachians, many of the Savoyards, and some citizens of Paris.

When a nation begins to be civilized, it has some opinions which are quite false. It believes in spirits, sorcerers, the enchantment of serpents and their immortality; in possessions of the devil, exorcisms, and soothsayers. It is persuaded, that seeds must grow rotten in the earth to spring up again, and that the quarters of the moon are the causes of accesses of fever.

A Talapoin persuades his followers, that the god Samonocodom sojourned some time at Siam, and that he cut down all the trees in a forest which prevented him from flying his kite at his ease, which was his favourite amusement. This idea takes root in their heads; and finally, an honest man who might doubt this adventure of Samonocodom, would run the risk of being stoned. It requires ages to destroy a popular opinion.

Opinion is called the queen of the world; it is so: for when reason opposes it, it is condemned to death. It must rise twenty times from its ashes, to gradually drive away the usurper.

OPTIMISM.

I BEG of you, gentlemen, to explain to me how everything is for the best; for I do not understand it.

Does it signify, that everything is arranged and ordered according to the laws of the impelling power? That I comprehend and acknowledge.

Do you mean, that every one is well and possesses the means of living—that nobody suffers? You know that such is not the case.

Are you of opinion, that the lamentable calamities which afflict the earth are good in reference to God; and that he takes pleasure in them? I credit not this horrible doctrine, nor you either.

Have the goodness to explain how all is for the

Digitized by Google

best. Plato the dialectician condescended to allow to God the liberty of making five worlds; because, said he, there are five regular solids in geometry, the tetrahedron, the cube, the hexahedron, the dodecahedron, and the icosahedron. But why thus restrict divine power? Why not permit the sphere which is still more regular, and even the cone, the pyramid of many sides, the cylinder, &c.?

God, according to Plato, necessarily chose the best of all possible worlds; and this system has been embraced by many christian philosophers, although it appears repugnant to the doctrine of original sin. After this transgression, our globe was no more the best of all possible worlds. If it was ever so, it might be so still; but many people believe it to be the worst of worlds instead of the best.

Leibnitz takes the part of Plato: more readers than one complain of their inability to understand either the one or the other; and for ourselves, having read both of them more than once, we avow our ignorance according to custom; and since the gospel has revealed nothing on the subject, we remain in darkness without remorse.

Leibnitz, who speaks of everything, has treated of original sin; and as every man of systems introduces into his plan something contradictory, he imagined that the disobedience towards God, with the frightful misfortunes which followed it, were integral parts of the best of worlds, and necessary ingredients of all possible felicity:—"Calla, calla, senor don Carlos: todo che se haze es por su ben."

What! to be chased from a delicious place, where we might have lived for ever only for the eating of an apple? What! to produce in misery wretched children, who will suffer everything, and in return produce others to suffer after them? What! to experience all maladies, feel all vexations, die in the midst grief, and by way of recompense be burned to all eternity—is this lot the best possible? It certainly is not *good* for us, and in what manner can it be so for God?

Digitized by Google

Leibnitz felt that nothing could be said to these objections, but nevertheless made great books, in which he did not even understand himself.

Lucullus, in good health, partaking of a good dinner with his friends and his mistress in the hall of Apollo, may jocosely deny the existence of evil; but let him put his head out of the window and he will behold wretches in abundance; let him be seized with a fever, and he will be one himself.

I do not like to quote; it is ordinarily a thorny proceeding. What precedes and what follows the passage quoted is too frequently neglected; and thus a thousand objections may arise. I must notwithstanding quote Lactantius, one of the fathers, who, in the thirteenth chapter on the anger of God, makes Epicurus speak as follows:—"God can either take away evil from the world and will not; or being willing to do so, cannot; or he neither can nor will; or lastly, he is both able and willing. If he is willing to remove evil and cannot, then is he not omnipotent. If he can, but will not remove it, then is he not benevolent; if he is neither able nor willing, then is he neither powerful nor benevolent: lastly, if both able and willing to nnihilate evil, how does it exist?"

The argument is weighty, and Lactantius replies to it very poorly, by saying that God wills evil, but has given us wisdom to secure the good. It must be confessed, that this answer is very weak in comparison with the objection; for it implies that God could bestow wisdom only by allowing evil—a pleasant wisdom truly! The origin of evil has always been an abyss, the depth of which no one has been able to sound. It was this difficulty which reduced so many ancient philosophers and legislators to have recourse to two principles—the one good, the other wicked. Typhon was the evil principle among the Egyptians; Arimanes, among the Persians. The Manicheans, it is said, adopted this theory; but as these people have never spoken either of a good or of a bad principle, we have nothing to prove it but the assertion.

Among the absurdities abounding in this world, and

Digitized by Google

which may be placed among the number of our evils, that is not the least which presumes the existence of two all-powerful beings, combatting which shall prevail most in this world, and making a treaty like the two physicians in Molière:—"Allow me the emetic, and I resign to you the lancet."

Basilides pretended, with the platonists of the first century of the church, that God gave the making of our world to his inferior angels and these, being inexpert, have constructed it as we perceive. This theological fable is laid prostrate by the overwhelming objection, that it is not in the nature of a deity all-powerful and all-wise to entrust the construction of a world to incompetent architects.

Simon, who felt the force of this objection, obviates it by saying, that the angel who presided over the workmen is damned for having done his business so slovenly: but the roasting of this angel amends nothing.

The adventure of Pandora among the Greeks scarcely meets the objection better. The box in which every evil is inclosed, and at the bottom of which remains hope, is indeed a charming allegory; but this Pandora was made by Vulcan, only to avenge himself of Prometheus, who had stolen fire to inform a man of clay.

The Indians have succeeded no better. God having created man, gave him a drug which would ensure him permanent health of body. The man loaded his ass with the drug, and the ass being thirsty, the serpent directed him to a fountain, and while the ass was drinking, purloined the drug.

The Syrians pretended, that man and woman having been created in the fourth heaven, they resolved to eat a cake in lieu of ambrosia, their natural food. Ambrosia exhaled by the pores; but after eating cake, they were obliged to relieve themselves in the usual manner. The man and the woman requested an angel to direct them to a water-closet. Behold, said the angel, that petty globe which is almost of no size at all; it is situated about sixty millions of leagues from this

Digitized by Google

place, and is the privy of the universe—go there as quickly as you can. The man and woman obeyed the angel and came here, where they have ever since remained: since which time the world has been what we now find it.

The Syrians will eternally be asked, why God allowed man to eat the cake, and experience such a crowd of formidable ills?

I pass with speed from the fourth heaven to lord Bolingbroke. This writer, who doubtless was a great genius, gave to the celebrated Pope his plan of 'all for the best,' as it is found word for word in the posthumous works of lord Bolingbroke, and recorded by lord Shaftesbury in his Characteristics. Read in Shaftesbury's chapter of the Moralists, the following passage:—

"Much may be replied to these complaints of the defects of nature—How came it so powerless and defective from the hands of a perfect Being?—But I deny that it is defective. Beauty is the result of contrast, and universal concord springs out of a perpetual conflict. . . . It is necessary that everything be sacrificed to other things—vegetables to animals, and animals to the earth . . . . . The laws of the central power of gravitation, which give to the celestial bodies their weight and motion, are not to be deranged in consideration of a pitiful animal, who, protected as he is by the same laws, will soon be reduced to dust".

Bolingbroke, Shaftesbury, and Pope their working artisan, resolve the general question no better than the rest. Their 'all for the best' says no more than that all is governed by immutable laws; and who did not know that? We learn nothing when we remark, after the manner of little children, that flies are created to be eaten by spiders, spiders by swallows, swallows by hawks, hawks by eagles, eagles by men, men by one another to afford food to worms; and at last, at the rate of about a thousand to one, to be the prey of devils everlastingly.

There is a constant and regular order established among animals of all kinds—an universal order. When a stone is formed in my bladder, the mechanical pro-

Digitized by Google

cess is admirable: sandy particles pass by small degrees into my blood; they are filtered by the reins; and passing the urethra, deposit themselves in my bladder; where, uniting agreeably to the Newtonian attraction, a stone is formed which gradually increases, and I suffer pains a thousand times worse than death by the finest arrangement in the world. A surgeon, perfect in the art of Tubal-cain, thrusts into me a sharp instrument; and cutting into the perineum, seizes the stone with his pincers, which breaks during the endeavours, by the necessary laws of mechanism; and owing to the same mechanism, I die in frightful torments. All this is 'for the best,' being the evident result of unalterable physical principles, agreeably to which I know as well as you that I perish.

If we were insensitive, there would be nothing to say against this system of physics; but this is not the point on which we treat. We ask, if there are not physical evils, and whence do they originate? There is no absolute evil, says Pope in his Essay on Man; or if there are particular evils, they compose a general good.

It is a singular general good which is composed of the stone, and the gout,—of all sorts of crimes and sufferings, and of death and damnation.

The fall of man is our plaister for all these particular maladies of body and soul, which you call "the general health;" but Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke have attacked original sin. Pope says nothing about it; but it is clear that their system saps the foundations of the christian religion, and explains nothing at all.

In the mean time, this system has been since approved by many theologians, who willingly embrace contradictions. Be it so; we ought to leave to everybody the privilege of reasoning in their own way upon the deluge of ills which overwhelms us. It would be as reasonable to prevent incurable patients from eating what they please. "God," says Pope, "beholds, with an equal eye, a hero perish or a sparrow fall; the destruction of an atom, or the ruin of a thousand

Digitized by Google

planets; the bursting of a bubble, or the dissolution of a world."

This, I must confess, is a pleasant consolation. Who does not find a comfort in the declaration of lord Shaftesbury, who asserts, "that God will not derange his general system for so miserable an animal as man?" It must be confessed at least, that this pitiful creature has a right to cry out humbly, and to endeavour, while bemoaning himself, to understand why these eternal laws do not comprehend the good of every individual.

This system of 'all for the best,' represents the Author of Nature as a powerful and malevolent monarch, who cares not for the destruction of four or five hundred thousand men, nor of the many more who in consequence spend the rest of their days in penury and tears, provided that he succeeds in his designs.

Far therefore from the doctrine—that this is the best of all possible worlds—being consolatory, it is a hopeless one to the philosophers who embrace it. The question of good and evil remains in remediless chaos for those who seek to fathom it in reality. It is a mere mental sport to the disputants, who are captives that play with their chains. As to unreasoning people, they resemble the fish which are transported from a river to a reservoir, with no more suspicion that they are to be eaten during the approaching Lent, than we have ourselves of the facts which originate our destiny.

Let us place at the end of every chapter of metaphysics, the two letters used by the Roman judges when they did not understand a pleading, L. N. non liquet—it is not clear. Let us above all silence the knaves who, overloaded like ourselves with the weight of human calamities, add the mischief of their calumny: let us refute their execrable imposture, by having recourse to faith and providence.

Some reasoners are of opinion, that it agrees not with the nature of the Great Being of beings, for things to be otherwise than they are. It is a rough system, and I am too ignorant to venture to examine it.

Digitized by Google

ORACLES.

SECTION I.

After the sect of the Pharisees among the Jews had become acquainted with the devil, some reasoners among them began to entertain the idea, that the devil and his companions inspired, among all other nations, the priests and statues that delivered oracles. The Sadducees had no belief in such beings. They admitted neither angels nor demons. It appears that they were more philosophic than the Pharisees, and consequently less calculated to obtain influence and credit with the people.

The devil was the great agent with the Jewish populace in the time of Gamaliel, John the baptist, James Oblia, and Jesus his brother, who was our Saviour Jesus Christ. Accordingly, we perceive that the devil transports Jesus sometimes into the wilderness, sometimes to the pinnacle of the temple, and sometimes to a neighbouring hill from which might be discovered all the kingdoms of the world; the devil takes possession, when he pleases, of the persons of boys, girls, and animals.

The Christians, although mortal enemies of the Pharisees, adopted all that the Pharisees had imagined of the devil; as the Jews had long before introduced among themselves the customs and ceremonies of the Egyptians. Nothing is so common as to imitate the practices of enemies, and to use their weapons.

In a short time, the fathers of the church ascribed to the devil all the religions which divided the earth, all pretended prodigies, all great events, comets, plagues, epilepsies, scrofula, &c. The poor devil, who was supposed to be roasting in a hole under the earth, was perfectly astonished to find himself master of the world. His power afterwards increased wonderfully from the institution of monks.

The motto or device of all these new-comers was, "Give me money, and I will deliver you from the devil." But both the celestial and terrestrial power

Digitized by Google

of these gentry received at length a terrible check from the hand of one of their own brotherhood, Luther, who quarrelling with them about some beggarly trifle, disclosed to the world all the trick and villainy of their mysteries. Hondorf, an eye-witness, tells us, that the reformed party having expelled the monks from a convent at Eisenach in Thuringia, found in it a statue of the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus, contrived with such art, that when offerings were placed upon the altar, the virgin and child bent their heads in sign of grateful acknowledgment, but turned their backs on those who presented themselves with empty hands.

In England the case was much worse. When by order of Henry VIII. a judicial visitation took place of all the convents, half of the nuns were found in a state of pregnancy; and this, at least it may be supposed, was not by the operation of the devil. Bishop Burnet relates, that in a hundred and forty-four convents, the depositions taken by the king's commissioners attested abominations which those of Sodom and Gomorrah did not even approach.* In fact, the English monks might naturally be expected to be more dissolute than the inhabitants of Sodom, as they were more rich. They were in possession of the best lands in the kingdom. The territory of Sodom and Gomorrah, on the contrary, produced neither grain, fruit, nor pulse; and being moreover deficient even in water fit to drink, could be neither more nor less than a frightful desart, inhabited by miserable wretches too much occupied in satisfying their absolute necessities to have much time to devote to pleasures.

In short, these superb asylums of laziness having

* It is but fair to observe, that suffering from a strong exertion of despotic power, these dissolute habits of the despoiled monks and nuns were systematically exaggerated by the tools of that power. Voltaire admits this with respect to the persecuted knights templars and others; and indeed this species of detraction has been the common policy of despotism and its satellites in all ages. With respect to the morality of the monasteries at this period, its odour was doubtless strong: and little reason existed then, and certainly none at all at present, for adding "perfume unto the violet."—T.

Digitized by Google

been suppressed by act of parliament, all the instruments of their pious frauds were exposed in the public places; the famous crucifix of Brocksley, which moved and marched like a puppet; phials of a red liquid which was passed off for blood shed by the statues of saints when they were dissatisfied with the court; candlesticks of tinned iron, in which the lighted candles were carefully placed so as to make the people believe they were the same candles that were always burning; speaking tubes (sarbacans) which communicated between the sacristy and the roof of the church, and by which celestial voices were occasionally heard, by apparent devotees, who were paid for hearing them; in short, everything that was ever invented by knavery to impose upon imbecility.

Many sensible persons who lived at this period, being perfectly convinced that the monks, and not the devils, had employed all these pious stratagems, began to entertain the idea that the case had been very similar with the religions of antiquity; that all the oracles and all the miracles so highly vaunted by ancient times, had been merely the tricks of charlatans; that the devil had never had anything to do with such matters; and that the simple fact was, that the Greek, Roman, Syrian, and Egyptian priests had been still more expert than our modern monks.

The devil therefore thus lost much of his credit; insomuch, that at length the honest Bekker, whose article you may consult,* wrote his tiresome book against the devil, and proved by a hundred arguments that he had no existence. The devil himself made no answer to him, but the ministers of the holy gospel, as you have already seen, did answer him; they punished the honest author for having divulged their secret, and took away his living; so that Bekker fell a victim to the nullity of Belzebub.

It was the lot of Holland to produce the most formidable enemies of the devil. The physician Van Dale, a humane philosopher, a man of profound learn-

* In the second volume of this Dictionary.

Digitized by Google

ing, a most charitable citizen, and one whose naturally bold mind became proportionately bolder in consequence of his intrepidity being founded on virtue, undertook at length the task of enlightening mankind, always enslaved by ancient errors, and always spreading the bandage that covers their eyes, until at last some powerful flash of light discovers to them a corner of truth of which the greater number are completely unworthy. He proved, in a work abounding in the most recondite learning, that the devils had never delivered a single oracle, had never performed a single prodigy, and had never mingled in human affairs at all; and that there never had in reality been any demons but those impostors who had deceived their fellow men. The devil should never ridicule or despise a sensible physician. Those who know something of nature are very formidable enemies to all juggling performers of prodigies. If the devil would be advised by me, he would always address himself to the faculty of theology, and never to the faculty of medicine.

Van Dale proved then, by numberless authorities, not merely that the pagan oracles were mere tricks of the priests, but that these knaveries, consecrated all over the world, had not ceased at the time of John the Baptist, and Jesus Christ, as was piously and generally thought to be the case. Nothing was more true, more clear, more decidedly demonstrated, than this doctrine announced by the physician Van Dale; and there is no man of education and respectability who now calls it in question.

The work of Van Dale is not perhaps very methodical, but it is one of the most curious works that ever came from the press. For, from the gross forgeries of the pretended Histape and the Sibyls; from the apocryphal history of the voyage of Simon Barjonas to Rome, and the compliments which Simon the Magician sent him through the medium of his dog; from the miracles of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, and especially the letter which that saint wrote to the devil, and which was safely delivered according to its address;

Digitized by Google

down to the miracles of the reverend fathers the jesuits, and the reverend fathers the capuchins;—nothing is forgotten. The empire of imposture and stupidity is completely developed before the eyes of all who can read; but they, alas! are only a small number.

Far indeed was that empire at that period from being destroyed in Italy, France, Spain, the States of Austria, and more especially in Poland, where the jesuits then bore absolute sway. Diabolical possessions and false miracles still inundated one half of besotted and barbarised Europe. The following account is given by Van Dale of a singular oracle that was delivered in his time at Terni, in the States of the Pope, about the year 1650; and the narrative of which was printed at Venice by order of the government:—

A hermit of the name of Pasquale, having heard that Jacovello, a citizen of Terni, was very covetous and rich, came to Terni to offer up his devotions in the church frequented by the opulent miser, soon formed an acquaintance with him, flattered him in his ruling passion, and persuaded him that it was a service highly acceptable to God, to take as much care as possible of money; it was indeed expressly enjoined in the gospel, as the negligent servant who had not put out his lord's money to interest at five hundred per cent was thrown into outer darkness.

In the conversations which the hermit had with Jacovello, he frequently entertained him with plausible discourses held by crucifixes and by a quantity of Italian virgin-marys. Jacovello agreed that the statues of saints sometimes spoke to men, and told him, that he should believe himself one of the elect, if ever he could have the happiness to hear the image of a saint speak.

The friendly Pasquale replied, that he had some hope he might be able to give him that satisfaction in a very little time; that he expected every day from Rome a death's head, which the Pope had presented to one of his brother hermits; and that this head spoke quite as distinctly and sensibly as the trees of Dodona, or even the ass of Balaam. He showed him the iden-

Digitized by Google

tical head in fact, four days after this conversation. He requested of Jacovello the key of a small cave and an inner chamber, that no person might possibly be a witness of the awful mystery. The hermit, having introduced a tube from this cave into the head, and made every other suitable arrangement, went to prayer with his friend Jacovello, and the head at that moment uttered the following words: "Jacovello, I will recompense thy zeal. I announce to thee a treasure of a hundred thousand crowns under a yew-tree in thy garden. But thou shalt die by a sudden death, if thou makest any attempt to obtain this treasure until thou hast produced before me a pot containing coin amounting to ten gold marks."

Jacovello ran speedily to his coffers, and placed before the oracle a pot containing the ten marks. The good hermit had had the precaution to procure a similar vessel which he had filled with sand, and he dexterously substituted that for the pot of Jacovello, on his turning his back, and then left the pious miser with one death's head more, and ten gold marks less, than he had before.

Nearly such is the way in which all oracles have been delivered, beginning with those of Jupiter Ammon, and ending with that of Trophonius.

One of the secrets of the priests of antiquity, as it is of our own, was confession in the mysteries. It was by this that they gained correct and particular information about the affairs of families, and qualified themselves in a great measure to give pertinent and suitable replies to those who came to consult them. To this subject applies the anecdote which Plutarch has rendered so celebrated. A priest once urging an initiated person to confession, that person said—To whom should I confess? To God, replied the priest. Begone then man, said the desired penitent; begone and leave me alone with God.

It would be almost endless to recount all the interesting facts and narratives with which Van Dale has enriched his book. Fontenelle did not translate it, but

Digitized by Google

he extracted from it what he thought would be most suitable to his countrymen, who love sprightly anecdote and observation better than profound knowledge. He was eagerly read by what in France is called good company; and Van Dale, who had written in Latin and Greek, had been read only by the learned. The rough diamond of Van Dale shone with exquisite brilliancy after the cutting and polish of Fontenelle: the success of the work was such that the fanatics became alarmed. Notwithstanding all Fontenelle's endeavours to soften down the expressions of Van Dale, and his explaining himself sometimes with the licence of a Norman, he was too well understood by the monks, who never like to be told that their brethren have been impostors.

A certain jesuit of the name of Baltus, born near Messina, one of that description of learned persons who know how to consult old books, and to falsify and cite them, although after all nothing to the purpose, took the part of the devil against Van Dale and Fontenelle. The devil could not have chosen a more tiresome and wretched advocate; his name is now known solely from the honour he had of writing against two celebrated men who advocated a good cause.

Baltus likewise, in his capacity of Jesuit, caballed with no little perseverance and bitterness on the occasion, in union with his brethren, who at that time were as high in credit and influence as they have since been plunged deep in ignominy. The jansenists, on their part, more impassioned and exasperated than even the jesuits, clamoured in a still louder tone than they did. In short, all the fanatics were convinced, that it would be all over with the christian religion, if the devil were not supported in his rights.

In the course of time the books of jansenists and jesuits have all sunk into oblivion. That of Van Dale still remains for men of learning, and that of Fontenelle for men of wit.

With respect to the devil, he resembles both jesuits and jansenists, and is losing credit from day to day.

Digitized by Google

SECTION II.

Some curious and surprising histories of oracles, which it was thought could be ascribed only to the power of genii, made the christians think they were delivered by demons, and that they had ceased at the coming of Christ. They were thus enabled to save the time and trouble that would have been required by an investigation of the facts; and they thought to strengthen the religion which informed them of the existence of demons, by referring to those beings such events.

The histories however that were circulated on the subject of oracles are exceedingly suspicious.* That of Thamus, to which Eusebius gives credit, and which Plutarch alone relates, is followed in the same history by another story so ridiculous, that that would be sufficient to throw discredit upon it; but it is, besides, incapable of any reasonable interpretation. If this great Pan were a demon, can we suppose the demons incapable of communicating the event of his death to one another without employing Thamus about it? If the great Pan were Jesus Christ, how came it that not a single pagan was undeceived with respect to his religion, and converted to the belief, that this same Pan was in fact Jesus Christ who died in Judea, if God himself compelled the demons to announce this death to the pagans?

The history of Thulis, whose oracle is clear and positive on the subject of the Trinity, is related only by Suidas. This Thulis, king of Egypt, was not certainly one of the Ptolemies. What becomes of the whole oracle of Serapis, when it is ascertained that Herodotus does not speak of that god, while Tacitus relates at length how and why one of the Ptolemies brought the god Serapis from Pontus, where he had only until then been known?

The oracle delivered to Augustus about the Hebrew infant who should be obeyed by all the gods, is abso-

* See, for the quotations, the latin work of the learned Anthony Van Dale, from which this extract is taken.

Digitized by Google

lutely inadmissible. Cedrenus quotes it from Eusebius, but it is not now to be found in him. It certainly is not impossible that Cedrenus may have made a false quotation, or have quoted a work falsely ascribed to Eusebius; but how is it to be accounted for, that all the early apologists for christianity should have preserved complete silence with respect to an oracle so favourable to their religion?

The oracles which Eusebius relates from Porphyry, who was attached to paganism, are not of a more embarrassing nature than those just noticed. He gives them to us stripped of all the accompanying circumstances that attended them in the writings of Porphyry. How do we know whether that pagan did not refute them? For the interest of his cause it would naturally have been an object for him to do so; and if he did not do it, most assuredly it was from some concealed motive, such, for instance, as presenting them to the christians only for an occasion to prove and deride their credulity, if they should really receive them as true and rest their religion on such weak foundations.

Besides, some of the ancient christians reproached the pagans with being the dupes of their priests. Observe how Clement of Alexandria speaks of them:—"Boast as long as you please of your childish and impertinent oracles, whether of Claros or the Pythian Apollo, of Dindymus or Amphilochus; and add to these your augurs and interpreters of dreams and prodigies. Bring forward also those clever gentry who, in the presence of the mighty Pythian Apollo, effect their divinations through the medium of meal or barley, and those also who, by a certain talent of ventriloquism, have obtained such high reputation. Let the secrets of the Egyptian temples, and the necromancy of the Etruscans, remain in darkness; all these things are most certainly nothing more than decided impostures, as completely tricks as those of a juggler with his cups and balls. The goats carefully trained for the divination, the ravens elaborately instructed to deliver the oracles, are—if we may use the expression—merely

Digitized by Google

accomplices of the charlatans by whom the whole world has thus been cheated."

Eusebius, in his turn, displays a number of excellent reasons to prove that oracles could be nothing but impostures; and if he attributes them to demons, it is the result of deplorable prejudice or of an affected respect for general opinion. The pagans would never admit, that their oracles were merely the artifices of their priests; it was imagined therefore, by rather an awkward process of reasoning, that a little was gained in the dispute by admitting the possibility, that there might be something supernatural in their oracles, and insisting at the same time, that if there were, it was the operation, not of the deity, but of demons.

It is no longer necessary now, in order to expose the finesse and stratagems of priests, to resort to means which might themselves appear too strongly marked by those qualities. A time has already been when they were completely exhibited to the eyes of the whole world,—the time, I mean, when the christian religion proudly triumphed over paganism under christian emperors.

Theodoret says that Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, exhibited to the inhabitants of that city the hollow statues into which the priests entered, from secret passages, to deliver the oracles. When, by Constantine's order, the temple of Esculapius at Egea, in Cilicia, was pulled down, there was driven out of it, says Eusebius in his life of that Emperor, not a god, nor a demon, but the human impostor who had so long abused the credulity of nations. To this he adds the general observation, that in the statues of the gods that were thrown down, not the slightest appearance was found of gods, or demons, or even any wretched and gloomy spectres, but only hay, straw, or the bones of the dead.

The greatest difficulty respecting oracles is surmounted, when it is ascertained and admitted, that demons had no concern with them. There is no longer any reason why they should cease precisely on the coming of Jesus Christ. And moreover, there

Digitized by Google

many proofs that oracles continued more than four hundred years after Jesus Christ, and that they were not totally silenced but by the total destruction of paganism.

Suetonius, in the life of Nero, says that the oracle of Delphi warned that emperor to beware of seventy-three years, and that Nero concluded he was to die at that age, never thinking upon old Galba, who, at the age of seventy-three, deprived him of the empire.

Philostratus, in his life of Apollonius of Tyana, who saw Domitian, informs us that Apollonius visited all the oracles of Greece, and that of Dodona, and that of Delphos, and that of Amphiaraus.

Plutarch, who lived under Trajan, tells us that the oracle of Delphos still subsisted, although there was then only one priestess, instead of two or three.

Under Adrian Dion Chrysostom relates, that he consulted the oracle of Delphos; he obtained from it an answer which appeared to him not a little perplexed, and which in fact was so.

Under the Antonines Lucian asserts, that a priest of Tyana went to enquire of the false prophet Alexander, whether the oracles which were then delivered at Dindymus, Claros, and Delphos, were really answers of Apollo, or impostures? Alexander had some fellow-feeling for these oracles, which were of a similar description to his own, and replied to the priest, that that was not permitted to be known; but when the same wise enquirer asked what he should be after his death, he was boldly answered, "You will be a camel, then a horse, afterwards a philosopher, and at length a prophet as great as Alexander."

After the Antonines, three emperors contended for the empire. The oracle of Delphos was consulted, says Spartian, to ascertain which of the three the republic might expect as its head. The oracle answered in a single verse to the following purport:—The black is better; the African is good; the white is the worst. By the black was understood Pescennius Niger; by the African, Severus Septimus, who was from Africa; and by the white, Claudius Albinus.

Digitized by Google

Dion, who did not conclude his history before the eighth year of Alexander Severus, that is, the year 230, relates that in his time Amphilochus still delivered oracles in dreams. He informs us also, that there was in the city of Apollonia an oracle which declared future events by the manner in which the fire caught and consumed the incense thrown upon an altar.

Under Aurelian, about the year 272, the people of Palmyra, having revolted, consulted an oracle of Sarpedonian Apollo in Cilicia; they again consulted that of the Aphacian Venus.

Licinius, according to the account of Sozomen, designing to renew the war against Constantine, consulted the oracle of Apollo of Dindymus, and received from it in answer two verses of Homer; of which the sense is—Unhappy old man, it becomes not you to combat with the young! you have no strength, and are sinking under the weight of age.

A certain god, scarcely if at all known, of the name of Besa, if we may credit Ammianus Marcellinus, still delivered oracles upon billets at Abydos, in the extremity of the Thebais, under the reign of Constantius.

Finally, Macrobius, who lived under Arcadius and Honorius, sons of Theodosius, speaks of the god of Heliopolis of Syria and his oracle, and of the fortunes of Antium, in terms which distinctly imply that they all still subsisted in his time.

We may observe, that it is not of the slightest consequence whether these histories are true, or whether the oracles in fact delivered the answers attributed to them; it is completely sufficient for the purpose that false answers could be attributed only to oracles which were in fact known still to subsist; and the histories which so many authors have published clearly prove, that they did not cease but with the cessation of paganism itself.

Constantine pulled down but few temples, nor indeed could he venture to pull them down but upon a pretext of crimes committed in them. It was upon this ground, that he ordered the demolition of those of the Aphacian Venus, and of Esculapius which was

Digitized by Google

at Egea in Cilicia, both of them temples in which oracles were delivered. But he forbade sacrifices to the gods, and by that edict began to render temples useless.

Many oracles still subsisted when Julian assumed the reins of empire. He re-established some that were in a state of ruin; and he was even desirous of being the prophet of that of Dindymus. Jovian, his successor, began his reign with great zeal for the destruction of paganism; but in the short space of seven months, which comprised the whole time he reigned, he was unable to make any great progress. Theodosius, in order to attain the same object, ordered all the temples of the pagans to be shut up. At last, the exercise of that religion was prohibited under pain of death, by an edict of the emperors Valentinian and Marcian, in the year 451 of the vulgar era; and the destruction of paganism necessarily involved that of oracles.

This conclusion has nothing in it surprising or extraordinary; it is the natural consequence of the establishment of a new worship. Miraculous facts, or rather what it is desired should be considered as such, diminish in a false religion, either in proportion as it becomes firmly established and has no longer occasion for them, or in proportion as it gradually becomes weaker and weaker, because they no longer obtain credit. The ardent but useless desire to pry into futurity gave birth to oracles; imposture encouraged and sanctioned them; and fanaticism set the seal: for an infallible method of making fanatics is to persuade before you instruct. The poverty of the people, who had no longer anything left them to give; the imposture detected in many oracles, and thence naturally concluded to exist in all; and finally the edicts of the christian emperors;—such are the real causes of the establishment, and of the cessation, of this species of imposture. The introduction of an opposite state of circumstances into human affairs made it completely disappear; and oracles thus became involved in the vicissitude accompanying all human institutions.

Some limit themselves to observing, that the birth of Jesus Christ is the first epoch of the cessation of

Digitized by Google

oracles. But why, on such an occasion, should some demons have fled, while others remained? Besides, ancient history proves decidedly, that many oracles had been destroy edbefore this birth. All the distinguished oracles of Greece no longer existed, or scarcely existed, and the oracle was occasionally interrupted by the silence of an honest priest who would not consent to deceive the people. The oracle of Delphi, says Lucian, remains dumb since princes have become afraid of futurity; they have prohibited the gods from speaking, and the gods have obeyed them.

ORDEAL.

It might be imagined, that all the absurdities which degrade human nature were destined to come to us from Asia, the source at the same time of all the sciences and arts! It was in Asia and in Egypt, that mankind first dared to make the life or death of a person accused dependent on the throw of a die, or something equally unconnected with reason and decided by chance—on cold water or hot water, on red hot iron, or a bit of barley bread. Similar superstition, we are assured by travellers, still exists in the Indies, on the coast of Malabar, and in Japan.

This superstition passed from Egypt into Greece. There was a very celebrated temple at Trezene in which every man who perjured himself died instantly of apoplexy. Hippolytus, in the tragedy of Phedra, in the first scene of the fifth act, addresses the following lines to his mistress Aricia:—

Aux portes de Trezène, et parmi ces tombeaux,
Des princes de ma race antiques sepultures,
Est un temple sacré, formidable aux parjures.
C'est là que les mortels n'osent jurer en vain;
Le perfide y reçoit un châtiment soudain;
Et, craignant d'y trouver la mort inévitable,
Le mensonge n'a point de freiu plus redoubtable.

At Trezene's gates, amidst the ancient tombs
In which repose the princes of my race,
A sacred temple stands, the perjurer's dread.
No daring mortal there may falsely swear,
For swift the vengeance which pursues his crime,

Digitized by Google

Inevitable death his instant lot:
Nowhere has falsehood a more awful curb.

The learned commentator of the great Racine makes the following remark on these Trezenian proofs or ordeals:—

"M. de la Motte has remarked, that Hippolytus should have proposed to his father to come and hear his justification in this temple, where no one durst venture on swearing to a falsehood. It is certain, that in such a case Theseus could not have doubted the innocence of that young prince; but he had received too convincing evidence against the virtue of Phedra, and Hippolytus was not inclined to make the experiment. M. de la Motte would have done well to have distrusted his own good taste, when he suspected that of Racine, who appears to have foreseen the objection here made. In fact, Theseus is so prejudiced against Hippolytus, that he will not even permit him to justify himself by an oath."

I should observe, that the criticism of La Motte was originally made by the deceased marquis de Lassai. He delivered it at M. de la Faye's, at a dinner party at which I was present together with the late M. de la Motte, who promised to make use of it; and in fact, in his Discourses upon Tragedy, he gives the honour of the criticism to the marquis de Lassai. The remark appeared to me particularly judicious, as well as to M. de la Faye and to all the guests present, who—of course excepting myself—were the most able critics in Paris. But we all agreed that Aricia was the person who should have called upon Theseus to try the accused by the ordeal of the Trezenian temple, and so much the more so, as Theseus immediately after talks for a long time together to that princess, who forgets the only thing that could clear up the doubts of the father and vindicate the son. The commentator in vain objects, that Theseus has declared to his son he will not believe his oaths,—

Toujours les scelerats ont recours au parjure.
PHEDRA.—Act iv. scene 2.

The wicked always have recourse to oaths.

Digitized by Google

There is a prodigious difference between an oath taken in a common apartment, and an oath taken in a temple where the perjured are punished by sudden death. Had Aricia said but a single word upon the subject, Theseus could have had no excuse for not conducting Hippolytus to this temple; but, in that case, what would have become of the catastrophe?

Hippolytus then should not have mentioned at all the appalling power of the temple of Trezene to his beloved Aricia; he had no need whatever to take an oath of his love to her, for of that she was already most fully persuaded. In short, his doing so is an inadvertence, a small fault which escaped the most ingenious, elegant, and impassioned tragedian that we ever had.

From this digression I return to the barbarous madness of ordeals. They were not admitted in the Roman republic. We cannot consider as of one of these ordeals, the usage by which the most important enterprises were made to depend upon the manner in which the sacred pullets ate their vetches. We are here considering only ordeals applied to ascertain the guilt or innocence of men. It was never proposed to the Manliuses, Camilluses, or Scipios, to prove their innocence by plunging their hands into boiling water without its scalding them.

These suggestions of folly and barbarism were not admitted under the emperors. But the Tartars who came to destroy the empire (for the greater part of these plunderers issued originally from Tartary) filled our quarter of the world with their ridiculous and cruel jurisprudence which they derived from the Persians. It was not known in the eastern empire till the time of Justinian, notwithstanding the detestable superstition which prevailed in it. But, from that time the ordeals we are speaking of were received. This manner of trying men is so ancient that we find it established among the Jews in all periods of their history.

Korah, Dathan, and Abiram dispute the pontificate with the high priest Aaron in the wilderness; Moses commands them to bring him two hundred and fifty

Digitized by Google

censers, and says to them,—Let God chuse between their censers and that of Aaron. Scarcely had the revolted made their appearance in order to submit to this ordeal, before they were swallowed up by the earth, and fire from heaven struck two hundred and fifty of their principal adherents;* after which the Lord also destroyed fourteen thousand seven hundred more men of that party. The quarrel however for the priesthood, still continued between the chiefs of Israel and Aaron. The ordeal of rods was then employed; each man presented his rod, and that of Aaron was the only one which budded.

Although the people of God had levelled the walls of Jericho by the sound of trumpets, they were overcome by the inhabitants of Ai. This defeat did not appear at all natural to Joshua; he consulted the Lord, who answered that Israel had sinned; that some one had appropriated to his own use a part of the plunder that had been taken at Jericho, and there devoted as accursed. In fact, all ought to have been burnt, together with the men and women, children and cattle, and whoever had preserved and carried off any part was to be exterminated.† Joshua, in order to discover the offender, subjected all the tribes to the trial by lot. The lot first fell upon the tribe of Judah, then upon the family of Zarah, then upon the house of Zabdi, and finally upon the grandson of Zabdi, whose name was Acham.

Scripture does not explain how it was that these wandering tribes came to have houses; neither does it inform us what kind of lots were made use of on the occasion; but it is clear from the text that Acham, being convicted of stealing a small wedge of gold, a scarlet mantle, and two hundred shekels of silver, was burnt to death in the valley of Achor, together with his sons, his sheep, his oxen, and his asses; and even his very tent was burnt with him.

The promised land was divided by lot;‡ lots were drawn respecting the two goats of expiation, which

* Numbers, xvi. † Joshua. vii. ‡ Joshua, xiv.

Digitized by Google

should be sacrificed to the Lord, and which should go for a scape-goat into the wilderness.*

When Saul was to be chosen king, lots were consulted, and the lot fell on the tribe of Benjamin, on the family of Metri belonging to that tribe, and finally on Saul, the son of Kish, in the family of Metri†.

The lot fell upon Jonathan to be punished for having ate a little honey at the end of a rod.‡

The sailors of Joppa drew lots to learn from God what was the cause of the tempest.§ The lot informed them that it was Jonah; and they threw him into the sea.

All these ordeals by lot, which among other nations were merely profane superstitions, were the voice of God himself when employed by his cherished and beloved people, and so completely and decidedly the voice of God, that even the apostles filled the place of the apostle Judas by lot.‖ The two candidates for the succession were Matthias and Barsabas. Providence declared in favour of St. Matthias.

Pope Honorius, the third of that name, forbade by a decretal from that time forward the method of chusing bishops by lot. Deciding by lots was a very common practice, and was called by the pagans 'sortilegium.' Cato, in the Pharsalia, says,—

> Sortilegis egeant dubii. . . . .
>
> Book ix. 581.

There were other ordeals among the Jews in the name of the Lord, as for example, the waters of jealousy.¶ A woman suspected of adultery was obliged to drink of that water mixed with ashes, and consecrated by the high-priest. If she was guilty, she instantly swelled and died. It is upon the foundation of this law, that the whole christian world in the west established oracles for persons under juridical accusation, not considering that what was ordained even by

---

* Leviticus, xvi. ‡ 1 Sam. xiv, 42. ‖ Acts, i.
† 1 Sam. x. § Jonah, i. ¶ Numbers. v. 17.

Digitized by Google

God himself in the Old Testament was nothing more or less than an absurd superstition in the New.

Duel by wager of battle was one of those ordeals, and lasted down to the sixteenth century. He who killed his adversary was always in the right.

The most dreadful of all these curious and barbarous ordeals was that of a man's carrying a bar of red-hot iron to the distance of nine paces without burning himself. Accordingly, the history of the middle ages, fabulous as it is, does not record any instance of this ordeal, nor of that which consisted in walking over nine burning ploughshares. All the others might be doubted, or the deceptions and tricks employed in relation to them to deceive the judges might be easily explained. It was very easy, for example, to appear to pass through the trial of boiling water without injury; a vessel might be produced half full of cold water, into which the judicial boiling water might be put; and the accused might safely plunge his arm up to the elbow in the lukewarm mixture, and take up from the bottom the sacred blessed ring that had been thrown into it for that purpose.

Oil might be made to boil with water; the oil begins to rise and appears to boil when the water begins to simmer, and the oil at that time has acquired but a small degree of heat. In such circumstances, a man seems to plunge his hand into boiling water; but, in fact, moistens it with the harmless oil, which preserves it from injury by the water.

A champion may easily, by degrees, harden and habituate himself to holding, for a few seconds, a ring that has been thrown into the fire without any very striking or painful marks of burning.

To pass between two fires without being scorched is no very extraordinary proof of skill or address, when the movement is made with great rapidity and the face and hands are well rubbed with ointment. It is thus that the formidable Peter Aldobrandin, or 'The Fiery Peter,' as he was called, used to manage (if there is any truth in his history) when he passed between two

Digitized by Google

blazing fires at Florence, in order to demonstrate, with God's help, that his archbishop was a knave and debauchee. O, charlatans! charlatans! henceforth disappear for ever from history.

There existed a rather ludicrous ordeal which consisted in making an accused person try to swallow a piece of barley bread, which it was believed would certainly choke him if he were guilty. I am not however so much diverted with this case as with the conduct of harlequin, when the judge interrogated him concerning a robbery of which Dr. Balouard accused him. The judge was sitting at table, and drinking some excellent wine at the time, when harlequin was brought in; perceiving which, the latter takes up the bottle, and, pouring the whole of its contents into a glass, swallows it at a draught, saying to the doctor—If I am guilty of what you accuse me, sir, I hope this wine will prove poison to me.

ORDINATION.

If a soldier, charged by the king of France with the honour of conferring the order of St. Louis upon another soldier had not, when presenting the latter with the cross, the intention of making him a knight of that order, would the receiver of the badge be on that account the less a member of the order, than if such intention had existed? Certainly not.

How was it then, that many priests thought it necessary to be re-ordained after the death of the celebrated Lavardin, bishop of Mans? That singular prelate, who had instituted the order of 'Good Fellows'* (des Coteaux) bethought himself on his death-bed of a singular trick in the way of revenge, on a class of persons who had much annoyed him. He was well known as one of the most daring free-thinkers of the age of Louis XIV. and had been publicly upbraided with his infidel sentiments by many of those on whom he

* It was an order of wine-bibbers. Drunkards were then in vogue, and the bishop of Mans was at the head of them.

Digitized by Google

had conferred orders of priesthood. It is natural at the approach of death, for a sensitive and apprehensive soul to revert to the religion of its early years. Decency alone would have required of the bishop, that at least at his death he should give an example of edification to the flock to which he had given so much scandal by his life. But he was so deeply exasperated against his clergy as to declare that not a single individual of those whom he had himself ordained was really and truly a priest; that all their acts in the capacity of priests were null and void; and that he never entertained the intention of conferring any sacrament.

Such reasoning seems certainly characteristic, and just such as might be expected from a drunken man: the priests of Mans might have replied to him—It is not your intention that is of any consequence, but ours. We had an ardent and determined desire to be priests; we did all in our power to become such. We are perfectly ingenuous and sincere; if you are not so that is nothing at all to us. The maxim applicable to the occasion is, 'quicquid accipitur ad modum recipientis accipitur,' and not 'ad modum dantis.' When our wine-merchant has sold us a half a hogshead of wine, we drink it, although he might have a secret intention to hinder us from drinking it; we shall still be priests in spite of your testament.*

Those reasons were sound and satisfactory: however, the greater number of those who had been ordained by that bishop did not consider themselves as real and authorised priests, and subjected themselves to ordination a second time. Mascaron, a man of moderate talents, but of great celebrity as a preacher, persuaded them, both by his discourses and example, to have the ceremony repeated. The affair occasioned great scandal at Mans, and Paris, and Versailles; but like everything else was soon forgotten.

* One of the articles of the Church of England wisely provides against the nullity of ordinances and sacraments, in consequence of the unworthiness of the priest. Were not this the case, certain recent Irish episcopal gambols must have annihilated much sanctification.—T.

Digitized by Google

ORIGINAL SIN.

SECTION I.

THIS is a subject on which the socinians or unitarians take occasion to exult and triumph. They denominate this foundation of christianity its 'original sin.' It is an insult to God, they say; it is accusing him of the most absurd barbarity to have the hardihood to assert, that he formed all the successive generations of mankind to deliver them over to eternal tortures, under the pretext of their original ancestor having eaten of a particular fruit in a garden. This sacrilegious imputation is so much the more inexcusable among christians, as there is not a single word respecting this same invention of original sin, either in the Pentateuch, or in the prophets, or the gospels, whether apocryphal or canonical, or in any of the writers who are called 'the first fathers of the church.'

It is not even related in the book of Genesis, that God condemned Adam to death for eating an apple. God says to him, indeed, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." But the very same book of Genesis makes Adam live nine hundred and thirty years after indulging in this criminal repast. The animals, the plants, which had not partaken of this fruit died at the respective periods prescribed for them by nature. Man is evidently born to die, like all the rest.

Moreover, the punishment of Adam was never, in any way, introduced into the Jewish law. Adam was no more a Jew than he was a Persian or Chaldean. The first chapters of Genesis (at whatever period they were composed) were regarded by all the learned Jews as an allegory, and even as a fable not a little dangerous, since that book was forbidden to be read by any before they had attained the age of twenty-one.

In a word, the Jews knew no more about original sin than they did about the Chinese ceremonies; and, although divines generally discover in the scripture everything they wish to find there, either 'totidem

Digitized by Google

verbis,' or 'totidem literis,' we may safely assert that no reasonable divine will ever discover in it this surprizing and overwhelming mystery.

We admit, that St. Augustin was the first who brought this strange notion into credit; a notion worthy of the warm and romantic brain of an African debauchee and penitent; manichean and christian; tolerant and persecuting—who passed his life in perpetual self-contradiction.

What an abomination, exclaim the strict unitarians, so atrociously to calumniate the Author of Nature as even to impute to him perpetual miracles, in order that he may damn to all eternity the unhappy race of mankind, whom he introduces into the present life only for so short a span! Either he created souls from all eternity, upon which system, as they must be infinitely more ancient than the sin of Adam, they can have no possible connection with it; or these souls are formed whenever man and woman sexually associate, in which case the Supreme Being must be supposed continually watching for all the various associations of this nature that take place, to create spirits that he will render eternally miserable; or, finally, God is himself, the soul of all mankind, and upon this system damns himself. Which of these three suppositions is the most absurd and abominable? There is no fourth. For, the opinion that God waits six weeks before he creates a damned soul in a fœtus is, in fact, no other than that which creates it at the moment of sexual connection: the difference of six weeks cannot be of the slightest consequence in the argument.

I have merely related the opinion of the unitarians; but men have now attained such a degree of superstition that I can scarcely relate it without trembling.

SECTION II.

It must be acknowledged, that we are not acquainted with any father of the church before St. Augustin and St. Jerome, who taught the doctrine of original sin. St. Clement, of Alexandria, notwithstanding his profound knowledge of antiquity, far from speaking in any

Digitized by Google

one passage of his works of that corruption which has infected the whole human race, and rendered it guilty from its birth, says in express words,* "What evil can a new-born infant commit? How could it possibly prevaricate? How could such a being, which has, in fact, as yet done no one thing, fall under the curse of Adam?"

And it is worth observing, that he does not employ this language in order to combat the rigid opinion of original sin, which was not at that time developed, but merely to show that the passions, which are capable of corrupting all mankind, have, as yet, taken no hold of this innocent infant.

He does not say—This creature of a day would not be damned if it should now die, for no one had yet conjectured that it would be damned. St Clement could not combat a system absolutely unknown.

The great Origen is still more decisive than St. Clement of Alexandria. He admits, indeed, in his exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, that sin entered into the world by Adam, but he maintains that it is the inclination to sin that thus entered; that it is very easy to commit evil, but that it is not on that account said, man will always commit evil, and is guilty even as soon as he is born.

In short, original sin, in the time of Origen, consisted only in the misfortune of resembling the first man by being liable to sin like him.

Baptism was a necessary ordinance; it was the seal of christianity; it washed away all sins; but no man had yet said, that it washed away those which the subject of it had not committed. No one yet asserted, that an infant would be damned, and burned in everlasting flames, in consequence of its dying within two minutes of its birth. And an unaswerable proof on this point is, that a long period passed away before the practice of baptising infants became prevalent. Tertullian was averse to their being baptised; but, on the persuasion that original sin (of which these poor innocents could not possibly be guilty) would affect

* Strom. book iii.

Digitized by Google

their reprobation, and expose them to suffer boundless and endless torture, for a deed of which it was impossible for them to have the slightest knowledge: to refuse them the consecrated bath of baptism would be wilfully consigning them to eternal damnation. The souls of all the executioners in the world, condensed into the very essence of ingenious cruelty could not have suggested a more execrable abomination. In a word, it is an incontestable fact, that christians did not for a certain period baptise their infants, and it is therefore equally incontestable that they were very far from damning them.

This however is not all; Jesus Christ never said: The infant that is not baptised will be damned.* He came on the contrary to expiate all sins, to redeem mankind by his blood; therefore, infants could not be damned. Infants would, of course, 'à fortiori,' and preferably, enjoy this privilege. Our divine Saviour never baptised any person. Paul circumcised his disciple Timothy, but is nowhere said to have baptised him.

In a word, during the two first centuries the baptism of infants was not customary; it was not believed therefore that infants would become victims of the fault of Adam. At the end of four hundred years their salvation was considered in danger, and great uncertainty and apprehension existed on the subject.

In the fifth century appears Pelagius. He treated the opinion of original sin as monstrous. According to him, this dogma, like all others, was founded upon a mere ambiguity.

God had said to Adam in the garden: "In the day in which thou shalt eat of the tree of knowledge, thou shalt die." But, he did not die; and God pardoned him. Why then should he not spare his race to the thousandth generation? Why should he consign to

* In St. John, Jesus says to Nicodemus (chap. iii.) that the wind, the spirit, bloweth where it listeth, and that no man knoweth whither it goeth; that it is necessary to be born again; that a man cannot enter into the kingdom of God unless he is born again of water and the spirit. But he does not mention infants.

Digitized by Google

infinite and eternal torments the innocent infants whose father he received back into forgiveness and favour?

Pelagius considered God, not merely as an absolute master, but as a parent, who left his children at perfect liberty, and rewarded them beyond their merits, and punished them less than their faults deserved.

The language used by him and his disciples was: If all men are born objects of the eternal wrath of that being who confers on them life; if they can possibly be guilty before they can even think, it is then a fearful and execrable offence to give them being, and marriage is the most atrocious of crimes. Marriage, on this system, is nothing more or less than an emanation from the manichean principle of evil, and those who engage in it, instead of adoring God, adore the devil.

Pelagius and his partizans propagated this doctrine in Africa, where the reputation and influence of St. Augustin were unbounded. He had been a manichean, and seemed to think himself called upon to enter the lists against Pelagius. The latter was ill able to resist either Augustin or Jerome; various points however were contested, and the dispute proceeded so far that Augustin pronounced his sentence of damnation upon all children born, or to be born, throughout the world, in the following terms: "The catholic faith teaches that all men are born so guilty, that even infants are certainly damned when they die without having been regenerated in Jesus."

It would be but a wretched compliment of condolance to offer to a queen of China, or Japan, or India, Scythia or Gothia, who had just lost her infant son, to say—Be comforted, madam; his highness the prince royal is now in the clutches of five hundred devils, who turn him round and round in a great furnace to all eternity, while his body rests embalmed and in peace within the precincts of your palace.

The astonished and terrified queen enquires, why these devils should eternally roast her dear son the prince royal? She is answered that the reason of it is that his great-grand-father formerly eat of the fruit of knowledge, in a garden. Form an idea, if possible, of the looks and thoughts of the king, the queen, the

whole council, and all the beautiful ladies of the court!

The sentence of the African bishop appeared to some divines (for there are some good souls to be found in every place and class) rather severe, and was therefore mitigated by one Peter Chrysologus or Peter Golden-tongue, who invented a suburb to hell, called "limbo," where all the little boys and girls that died before baptism might be disposed of. It is a place in which these innocents vegetate without sensation; the abode of apathy; the place that has been called "The paradise of fools." We find this very expression in Milton. He places this paradise somewhere near the moon!*

Explication of Original Sin.

The difficulty is the same with respect to this substituted limbo as with respect to hell. Why should these poor little wretches be placed in this limbo? what had they done? how could their souls, which they had not in their possession a single day, be guilty of a gormandizing that merited a punishment of six thousand years?

St. Augustin, who damns them, assigns as a reason, that the souls of all men being comprised in that of Adam, it is probable that they were all accomplices. But, as the church subsequently decided, that souls are not made before the bodies which they are to inhabit are originated, that system falls to the ground, notwithstanding the celebrity of its author.

Others said, that original sin was transmitted from soul to soul, in the way of emanation, and that one soul, derived from another, came into the world with all the corruption of the mother-soul. This opinion was condemned.

After the divines had done with the question, the philosophers tried at it. Leibnitz, while sporting with his monads, amused himself with collecting together in Adam all the human monads with their little bodies

* Ariosto, in the moon itself, in which he deposits the lost wits of Orlando, the writings of Constantine bestowing Rome on pope Sylvester, and all the imaginary existences which never was.—T.

Digitized by Google

of monads. This was going further than St. Augustin. But this idea, which was worthy of Cyrano de Bergerac, met with very few to adopt and defend it.

Malebranche explains the matter by the influence of the imagination on mothers. Eve's brain was so strongly inflamed with the desire of eating the fruit, that her children had the same desire; just like the irresistibly authenticated case of the woman who, after having seen a man racked, was brought to bed of a dislocated infant.

Nicole reduced the affair to "a certain inclination, a certain tendency to concupiscence which we have derived from our mothers. This inclination is not an act; but it will one day become such." Well said, Nicole; bravo! But, in the mean time, why am I to be damned? Nicole does not even touch the difficulty, which consists in ascertaining how our own souls, which have but recently been formed, can be fairly made responsible for the fault of another soul that lived some thousands of years ago.

What, my good friends, *ought* to be said upon the subject? Nothing. Accordingly, I do not give *my* explication of the difficulty; I say not a single word.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

The orthography of most French books is ridiculous. Almost all ignorant printers print Wisigoths, Westphalia, Wirtemberg, Weteravia, &c.

They know not that the German double V which they thus write W is our consonant V, and that in German they are pronounced Veteravia, Vertemberg, Vestphalia, Visigoth. They write Altona instead of Altena, not knowing that in German an O surmounted with two points is like an E. They know not that in Holland 'oe' makes 'ou'; and they always make mistakes in writing this diphthong. Those committed every day by our translators of books are innumerable. As for orthography purely French, habit alone can support its incongruity. 'Em-ploi-e-roi-ent,' 'oc-troi-e-roi-ent,' which are pronounced octroiraient, emploiraient;

Digitized by Google

'pa-on,' which is pronounced pan; 'fa-on,' which we pronounce fan; 'la-on,' which we pronounce lan; and an hundred other such barbarities, induce us to say—

Hodieque manent vestigia ruris.

HORACE, Book ii. ep. i. v. 160.

And yet some traces of this rustic reign
For a long age remain'd, and still remain.

FRANCIS.

The above however prevent not Racine, Boileau and Quinault from charming the ear, or La Fontaine from always pleasing.

The English are much more inconsistent; they have perverted all the vowels, they pronounce them differently from all other nations. In orthography, we may say of them with Virgil, Eclogue i. line 67—

Et penitus toto divisos orbe Brittannos.

A race of men from all the world disjoin'd.

DRYDEN.

Yet they have changed their orthography within an hundred years; they no longer write 'loveth,' 'speaketh,' or 'maketh,' but 'loves,' 'speaks,' 'makes.'

The Italians have suppressed all their h's. They have made several innovations in favour of the softness of their language.

Writing is the painting of the voice; the more close the resemblance the better it is.

OVID.

SCHOLARS have not failed to write volumes to inform us exactly to what corner of the earth Ovidius Naso was banished by Octavius Cepias, surnamed Augustus. All that we know of it is, that born at Sulmo and brought up at Rome, he passed ten years on the right shore of the Danube, in the neighbourhood of the Black Sea. Though he calls this land barbarous, we must not fancy that it was a land of savages. There were verses made there: Cotis, the petty king of a part of Thrace, made Getic verses for Ovid. The Latin poet learnt Getic, and also composed lines in this language. It seems as if Greek poetry should have been understood in the ancient country of Orpheus, but this

Digitized by Google

country was then peopled by nations from the north, who probably spoke a Tartar dialect, a language approaching to the ancient Sclavonian. Ovid seemed not destined to make Tartar verses. The country of the Tomites, to which he was banished, was a part of Mysia, a Roman province, between mount Hemus and the Danube. It is situated in the forty-fourth degree and a half of latitude, like one of the finest climates of France; but the mountains which are at the south, and the winds of the north and east, which blow from the Euxine, the cold and dampness of the forests and of the Danube, rendered this country insupportable to a man born in Italy. Thus Ovid did not live long, but died there at the age of sixty. He complains in his Elegies of the climate and not of the inhabitants.

Quos ego, cùm loca sim vestra perosus, amo.

These people crowned him with laurel and gave him privileges, which prevented him not from regretting Rome. It was a great instance of the slavery of the Romans and of the extinction of all laws, when a man born of an equestrian family, like Octavius, exiled a man of another equestrian family, and when one citizen of Rome with one word sent another among the Scythians. Before this time it required a 'plebiscitum,' a law of the nation, to deprive a Roman of his country. Cicero, although banished by a cabal, had at least been exiled with the forms of law.

The crime of Ovid was incontestably that of having seen something shameful in the family of Octavius:—

Cur aliquid vidi, cur noxia lumina feci?

Why saw I ought, or why discover crime?

The learned have not decided whether he had seen Augustus with a prettier boy than Mannius, whom he said he would not have because he was too ugly; whether he saw some page in the arms of the empress Livia, whom this Augustus had espoused, while pregnant by another; whether he had seen the said Augustus occupied with his daughter or grand-daughter; or, finally, whether he saw him doing something still worse, 'torva tuentibus hircis?' It is most probable

Digitized by Google

that Ovid detected an incestuous correspondence, as an author, almost contemporary, named Minutionus Apuleius, says—'Pulsum quoque in exilium quod Augusti incestum vidisset.'

Octavius made a pretext of the innocent book of the Art of Love, a book very decently written, and in which there is not an obscene word, to send a Roman knight to the Black Sea. The pretence was ridiculous. How could Augustus, of whom we have still verses filled with obscenities, banish Ovid for having several years before given to his friends some copies of the Art of Love? How could he impudently reproach Ovid for a work written with decorum, while he approved of Horace, who lavishes allusions and phrases on the most infamous prostitution, and who proposed girls and boys, maid servants and valets indiscriminately? It is nothing less than impudence to blame Ovid and tolerate Horace. It is clear, that Octavius alleged a very insufficient reason, because he dared not allude to the real one. One proof that it related to some secret adventure of the sacred imperial family is, that the goat of Caprea—Tiberius, immortalized by medals for his debaucheries,—Tiberius, that monster of lust and dissimulation, did not recal Ovid, who rather than demand the favour from the author of the proscriptions and the poisoner of Germanicus, remained on the shores of the Danube.

If a Dutch, Polish, Swedish, English, or Venetian gentleman had by chance seen a stadtholder, or a king of Great Britain, Sweden or Poland, or a doge of Venice, commit some great sin, even if it was not by chance that he saw it; if he had even sought the occasion, and was so indiscreet as to speak of it, this stadtholder, king or doge could not legally banish him.

We can reproach Ovid almost as much as Augustus and Tiberius for having praised them. The eulogiums which he lavishes on them are so extravagant, that at present they would excite indignation if he had even given them to legitimate princes, his benefactors, instead of to tyrants, and to his tyrants in particular. You may be pardoned for praising a little too much a

Digitized by Google

prince who caresses you; but not for treating as a god one who persecutes you. It would have been an hundred times better for him to have embarked on the Black Sea, and retired into Persia by the Palus Mæotis, than to have written his 'Tristia.' He would have learnt Persian as easily as Getic, and might have forgotten the master of Rome near the master of Ecbatana. Some strong minds will say that there was still another part to take, which was to go secretly to Rome, address himself to some relations of Brutus and Cassius, and get up a twelfth conspiracy against Octavius;—but that was not in elegiac taste.

Poetical panegyrics are strange things! It is very clear that Ovid wished with all his heart, that some Brutus would deliver Rome from that Augustus, to whom in his verses he wished immortality.

I reproach Ovid with his Tristia alone. Bayle forms his system on the philosophy of chaos so ably exhibited in the commencement of the Metamorphoses:—

> Ante mare et terras, et quod tegit omnia cœlum,
> Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe.

Bayle thus translates these first lines: "Before there was an heaven, an earth, and a sea, nature was all homogeneous." In Ovid it is, "The face of nature was the same throughout the universe," which means not that all was homogeneous, but heterogeneous—this assemblage of different things appeared the same; 'unus vultus.'

Bayle criticises chaos throughout. Ovid, who in his verses is only the poet of the ancient philosophy, says that things hard and soft, light and heavy, were mixed together:

> Mollia cum duris, sine pondere habentia pondus.
> OVID MET. b. i. l. 20.

And this is the manner in which Bayle reasons against him:—

"There is nothing more absurd than to suppose a chaos which had been homogeneous from all eternity, though it had the elementary qualities, at least those

Digitized by Google

which we call alteratives, which are heat, cold, humidity, and dryness, as those which we call matrices, which are lightness and weight, the former the cause of upper motion, the latter of lower. Matter of this nature cannot be homogeneous, and must necessarily contain all sorts of heterogeneousness. Heat and cold, humidity and dryness, cannot exist together, unless their action and reaction temper and convert them into other qualities which assume the form of mixed bodies; and as this temperament can be made according to innumerable diversities of combinations, chaos must contain an incredible number of compound species. The only manner of conceiving matter homogeneous, is by saying, that the alterative qualities of the elements modify all the molecules of matter in the same degree in such a way, that throughout there is the same warmth, the same softness, the same odour, &c. But this would be to destroy with one hand that which has been built up with the other: it would be by a contradiction in terms to call chaos the most regular, the most marvellous for its symmetry, and the most admirable in its proportions that it is possible to conceive. I allow that the taste of man approves of a diversified rather than of a regular work; but our reason teaches us, that the harmony of contrary qualities, uniformly preserved throughout the universe, would be as admirable a perfection as the unequal division of them which has succeeded chaos. What knowledge and power would not the diffusion of this uniform harmony throughout nature demand! It would not be sufficient to place in any compound an equal quantity of all the four ingredients; of one there must be more and of another less, according as their force is greater or less for action or resistance; for we know that philosophers bestow action and reaction in a different degree on the elementary qualities. All would amount to an opinion that the power which metamorphosed chaos has withdrawn it, not from a state of strife and confusion as is pretended, but from a state of the most admirable harmony, which by the adjustment of the equilibrium of contrary forces, retained it in a repose equivalent to peace. It is cer-

Digitized by Google

tain therefore, that if the poets will insist on the homogeneity of chaos, they must erase all which they have added concerning the wild confusion of contrary seeds, of the undigested mass, and of the perpetual combat of conflicting principles.

"Passing over this contradiction, we shall find sufficient subject for opposing them in other particulars. Let us recommence the attack on eternity. There is nothing more absurd than to admit, for an infinite time, the mixture of the insensible particles of four elements; for as soon as you suppose in them the activity of heat, the action and re-action of the four primary qualities, and besides these, motion towards the centre in the elements of earth and water, and towards the circumference in those of fire and air, you establish a principle which necessarily separates these four kinds of body the one from the other, and for which a definite period alone is necessary. Consider a little that which is denominated 'the phial of the four elements.' There is put into it some small metallic particles; and then three liquids, the one much lighter than the other: shake these well together, and you no longer discern any of these component parts singly; each is confounded with the other. But leave your phial at rest for a short time, and you will find every one of them resume its pristine situation. The metallic particles will reassemble at the bottom of the phial, the lightest liquid will rise to the top, and the others take their stations according to their respective degrees of gravity. Thus a very short time will suffice to restore them to the same relative situation which they occupied before the phial was shaken. In this phial you behold the laws which nature has given in this world to the four elements, and, comparing the universe to this phial, we may conclude, that if the earth reduced to powder had been mingled with the matter of the stars, and with that of air and of water, in such a way as that the compound exhibited none of these elements by themselves, all would have immediately operated to disengage themselves, and at the end of a certain time, the particles of earth would form one mass, those of fire

Digitized by Google

another; and thus of the others in proportion to the lightness or heaviness of each of them."

I deny to Bayle, that the experiment of the phial infers a definite period for the duration of chaos. I inform him, that by heavy and light things, Ovid and the philosophers intended those which became so after God had placed his hand on them: I say to him—You take for granted that nature arranged all, and bestowed weight upon herself. You must begin by proving to me that gravity is an essential quality of matter, a position which has never been proved. Descartes in his romance has pretended, that body never became heavy until his vortices of subtle matter began to push them from the centre. Newton, in his correct philosophy, never says that gravitation or attraction is a quality essential to matter. If Ovid had been able to divine the Principia of Newton, he would have said—Matter was neither heavy nor in motion in my chaos; it was God who endowed it with these two properties; my chaos includes not the forces you imagine—'nec quidquam nisi pondus iners;' it was a powerless mass; 'pondus' here signifies not weight but mass.

Nothing could possess weight, before God bestowed on matter the principle of gravitation. In whatever degree one body is impelled towards the centre of another, would it be drawn or impelled by another, if the Supreme Power had not bestowed upon it this inexplicable virtue. Therefore Ovid will not only turn out a good philosopher, but a passable theologian.

You say,—"A scholastic theologian will admit without difficulty, that if the four elements had existed independently of God, with all the properties which they now possess, they would have formed of themselves the machine of the world, and have maintained it in the state which we now behold. There are therefore two great faults in the doctrine of chaos; the first of which is, that it takes away from God the creation of matter, and the production of the qualities proper to air, fire, earth, and water; the other, that after taking God away, he is made to appear unnecessarily on the theatre of the world, in order to assign their place to

Digitized by Google

the four elements. Our modern philosophers, who have rejected the faculties and the qualities of the peripatetician physics, will find the same defects in the description of the chaos of Ovid; for that which they call general laws of motion, mechanical principles, modifications of matter, the form, situation, and arrangement of atoms, comprehends nothing beyond the active and passive virtue of nature, which the peripatetics understand by the alterative and formative qualities of the four elements. Seeing therefore that, according to the doctrine of this school, these four bodies, separated according to their natural heaviness and lightness, form a principle which suffices for all generation, the Cartesians, Gassendists, and other modern philosophers, ought to maintain, that the motion, situation, and form of the particles of matter, are sufficient for the production of all natural effects, without excepting even the general arrangement which has placed the earth, the air, the water, and the stars where we see them. Thus the true cause of the world, and of the effect which it produces, is not different from the cause which has bestowed motion upon particles of matter,—whether at the same time that it assigned to each atom a determinate figure, as the Gassendists assert; or that it has only given to particles entirely cubic an impulsion which, by the duration of the motion according to certain laws, makes it ultimately take all sorts of forms—which is the hypothesis of the Cartesians. Both the one and the other consequently agree, that if matter had been, before the generation of the present world, as Ovid describes, it would have been capable of withdrawing itself from chaos by its own necessary operation, without the assistance of God. Ovid may therefore be accused of two oversights—having supposed, in the first place, that without the assistance of the Divinity, matter possessed the seeds of every compound, heat, motion, &c.; and in the second, that without the same assistance it could extricate itself from confusion. This is to give at once too much and too little to both God and matter; it is to pass over assistance when

Digitized by Google

most needed, and to demand it when no longer necessary."

Ovid may still reply—You are wrong in supposing that my elements originally possessed all the qualities which they possess at present. They had no qualities; matter existed naked, unformed, and powerless; and when I say, that in my chaos heat was mingled with cold, and dryness with humidity, I only employ these expressions to signify that there was neither cold nor heat, nor wet nor dry, which are qualities that God has placed in our sensations, and not in matter. I have not made the mistakes of which you accuse me. Your Cartesians and your Gassendists commit oversights with their atoms and their cubic particles; and their imaginations deal as little in truth as my Metamorphoses. I prefer Daphne changed into a laurel, and Narcissus into a flower, to subtle matter changed into suns, and denser matter transformed into earth and water. I have given you fables for fables, and your philosophers have given you fables for truth.

PARADISE—

There is no word whose meaning is more remote from its etymology. It is well known that it originally meant a place planted with fruit-trees; and, afterwards, the name was given to gardens planted with trees for shade. Such, in distant antiquity, were those of Saana, near Eden, in Arabia Felix, known long before the hordes of the Hebrews had invaded a part of the territory of Palestine.

This word 'paradise' is not celebrated among the Jews, excepting in the book of Genesis. Some Jewish canonical writers speak of gardens; but not one of them has mentioned a word about the garden denominated the 'earthly paradise.' How could it happen, that no Jewish writer, no Jewish prophet, or Jewish psalmodist, should have once cited that terrestrial paradise which we are talking of every day of our lives? This is almost incomprehensible. It has induced many daring

Digitized by Google

critics to believe that Genesis was not written till a very late period.

The Jews never took this orchard or plantation of trees—this garden, whether of plants or flowers—for heaven.

St. Luke is the first who uses the word 'paradise' as signifying heaven, when Jesus Christ says to the good thief—* "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise."

The ancients gave the name of 'heaven' to the clouds. That name would not have been exactly appropriate, as the clouds actually touch the earth by the vapours of which they are formed, and as heaven is a vague word signifying an immense space in which exist innumerable suns, planets, and comets, which has certainly but little resemblance to an orchard.

St. Thomas says, that there are three paradises—the terrestrial, the celestial, and the spiritual. I do not, I acknowledge, perfectly understand the difference between the spiritual and celestial. The spiritual orchard is, according to him, the beatific vision. But it is precisely that which constitutes the celestial paradise, it is the enjoyment of God himself.† I do not presume to dispute against the 'angel of the schools.' I merely say—Happy must he be who always resides in one of these three paradises!

Some curious critics have thought, that the paradise of the Hesperides, guarded by a dragon, was an imitation of the garden of Eden, kept by a winged ox or a cherub. Others, more rash, have ventured to assert that the ox was a bad copy of the dragon, and that the Jews were always gross plagiaries; but this will be admitted to be blasphemy, and that idea is insupportable.

Why has the name of paradise been applied to the square courts in the front of a church?

Why has the third row of boxes at the theatre or opera house been called 'paradise?'‡ Is it because, as these places are less dear than others, it was thought

* Luke xxiii. 43. † First Part, question cii.

‡ A similar equivoque to that which in England tenants the galleries with 'gods.'—T.

Digitized by Google

they were intended for the poor, and because it is pretended that in the other paradise there are far more poor persons than rich? Is it because these boxes are so high, that they have obtained a name which also signifies heaven? There is however some difference between ascending to heaven, and ascending to the third row of boxes.

What would a stranger think on his arrival at Paris, when asked—Are you inclined to go to paradise to see Pourceaugnac?

What incongruities and equivoques are to be found in all languages! How strongly is human weakness manifested in every object that is presented around us!

See the article Paradise in the great Encyclopædia. It is certainly better than this.

We conclude with the abbé de St. Pierre's favourite sentiment,—" Paradise to the beneficent."

PARLIAMENT OF FRANCE.

From Philip le Bel to Charles VII.

PARLIAMENT comes, no doubt; from 'parler;' and it is pretended that parler comes from the Celtic word paler, of which the Catalonians and the Spaniards made 'palabra.' Others assure us that it is from 'parabola,' and that of the word 'parabole' is made parliament. This is doubtless very useful erudition.

There is some appearance of more serious doctrine in those who tell you, that we are not able to discover monuments in which the barbarous word 'parlamentum' was found, until towards the time of the first crusades.

We can answer: The term parlamentum was then used to signify assemblies of the nation. Therefore, it was in use long before. A new term is never invented for ordinary things.

Philip III., in his charter of this establishment at Paris, speaks of ancient parliaments. We have sessions of judiciary parliament since 1254; and one proof

Digitized by Google

that the general word 'parlement' was often made use of in designating assemblies of the nation is, that as soon as we wrote in the French language, we gave this name to these assemblies; and the English, who took all their customs from us, called their assembly of peers a parliament.

This word, the source of so many equivoques, was applied to several other bodies; to the municipal officers of towns, to monks and schools—another proof of an ancient custom.

We will not here repeat how king Philip le Bel, who destroyed and formed so many things, formed a chamber of parliament at Paris to judge, in the capital, great law-suits which were formerly carried wherever the court assembled; how this chamber, which sat but twice a year, was pensioned by the king at five sous a day for each counsellor or judge. This chamber was necessarily composed of temporary members, since all had other employments; so that he who was a judge at Paris at All-hallows, commanded troops at Whitsuntide.

We will not repeat how this chamber for a long time judged no criminal process; how the clerks or graduates—commissioners established to report the causes to the lords judges and not to give their voices—were soon put in the places of these judges of the sword, who seldom knew how to read or write.

We know by what astonishing and melancholy fatality the first criminal process, judged by these new graduate judges, was that of Charles VII. their king, then dauphin of France; that they declared, without naming him, that he had forfeited his right to the crown; and how some days after, these same judges, overcome by the prevailing English party, condemned the dauphin, the descendant of St. Louis, to perpetual banishment on the 3rd of January, 1420; a sentence as incompetent as infamous—an eternal monument of the opprobrium and desolation in which France was plunged, and which the president Hénault has vainly endeavoured to palliate in his Abridgment, a work as estimable as useful. But everything wanders from its sphere in times of

Digitized by Google

trouble. The derangement of king Charles VI.; the assassination of the duke of Burgundy, committed by the friends of the dauphin; the solemn treaty of Troyes; the defection of all Paris and three parts of France; the great qualities, victories, glory, spirit, and good fortune of Henry V. solemnly declared king of France, —all tended to excuse the parliament.

After the death of Charles VI. in 1422, and ten days after his obsequies, all the members of the parliament of Paris swore on a missal, in the great chamber, obedience and fidelity to the young king of England, Henry VI. the son of Henry V.; and this tribunal caused a woman of Paris to be put to death, who had the courage to excite several citizens to receive their legitimate king into his capital. This respectable woman was executed with all the faithful citizens whom the parliament could seize. Charles VII. erected another parliament at Poictiers; it was less numerous, less powerful, and ill-paid.

Some members of the parliament of Paris, disgusted with the English, fled from it. And finally, when Charles re-took Paris, and gave a general amnesty, the parliaments were united.

Parliament—The extent of its Rights.

Machiavel, in his Political Remarks on Titus Livius, says that parliaments are the strength of the king of France. He was very right in one sense. The Italian Machiavel regarded the pope as the most dangerous monarch of christianity. All kings made court to him; all would engage him in their quarrels; and when he exacted too much, when a king of France dared boldly to refuse it to him,—this king had his parliament prepared to declare the pretensions of the pope contrary to the laws of the kingdom, extortionary, abusive, and absurd; and the king excused himself with the pope, saying that he could not command his parliament.

It was still worse when the kings and the popes quarrelled. The sentences of the former triumphed over all bulls, and the tiara was overset by the hand of justice. But this body never constituted the strength

Digitized by Google

of kings when they were in want of money; and as this is the only source of the strength which governs, kings would always possess it if possible, it must therefore be demanded of the states general. The court of the parliament of Paris, instituted to render justice, never interfered with finance until Francis I. The famous reply of the president, Jean de la Vacquerie, to the duke of Orleans (Louis XII.) is a sufficiently strong proof of it:—"The parliament is to render justice to the people: finances, war, and the government of the king, are not within its jurisdiction."

We cannot pardon president Hénault for not relating this speech, which so long served for the basis of public right in France, supposing that this country ever knew a public right.

Parliament—Right of Registering.

Register, memorial, journal, book of right. This custom was in all times observed by polished nations, and much neglected by the barbarians who attacked the Roman empire. The clergy of Rome were more attentive: they registered everything, and always to their own advantage. The Visigoths, Vandals, Burgundians, Franks, and all the other savages, had not registers for marriage, births, and deaths. True, their emperors caused their treaties and ordinances to be written; they were preserved, sometimes in one castle, sometimes in another; and when this castle was taken by some predatory chieftain, the record was lost. The ancient acts which formerly existed were deposited in the tower of London. We also often find them elsewhere, with the monks, who by their industry frequently supplied the want of public monuments.

What faith can we have in these ancient monuments after the adventure of the false decretals, which were respected for five hundred years, as much and more than the gospel, and after so many false martyrologies, false legends, and false acts? Our Europe was too long composed of a multitude of predatory bands who pillaged all; of a small number of forgers of writings who deceived these ignorant robbers, and of a popu-

Digitized by Google

lace as brutal as indigent, bound to the earth the whole year, to nourish all these people.

It is believed, that Philip Augustus lost the receptacle in which his records and titles were kept; we know not on what occasion, nor how, nor why he exposed to the injuries of the air, parchments which he should have carefully shut up.

We believe that Stephen Boileau, provost of Paris, in the time of St. Louis, was the first who kept a journal, and that he was imitated by John de Mortluc, registrar of the parliament of Paris in 1313, and not in 1256, a mistake of pure inadvertence in the great Dictionary at the word Register.

By degrees, kings became accustomed to cause to be registered by the parliament several of their ordinances, and above all the laws that the parliament was obliged to maintain.

It is a common opinion, that the first registered ordinance is that of Philip of Valois, on his regal rights in 1332, in the month of September, which however was not registered until 1334. No edict on finances was registered in this court, either by the king or his successors, until Francis I.

Charles V. held a court of justice in 1374, to register the law which fixes the majority of kings at forty years.

A very singular fact is, that the erection of almost all the parliaments of the kingdom were not presented to the parliament of Paris, to be there registered and confirmed.

Treaties of peace were sometimes registered; but it was there frequently dispensed with. Nothing has been stable and permanent; nothing has been uniform. The treaty of Utrecht, which terminated the fatal war on the succession of Spain, is not registered. Edicts are registered which establish and suppress assisers of wood, assayers of butter, and meters of coals.*

* In the course of time this ceremony of registering became the only political restrictive power in the possession of the French parliament. They ventured occasionally to refuse to register that which they did not approve: a contumacy which Louis XIV. and XV.

Digitized by Google

Remonstrances of Parliament.

Every company, every citizen, has a right to carry his complaints to the sovereign, by the natural law which permits us to cry when we suffer. The first remonstrances of the parliament of Paris were addressed to Louis XI. by the express command of this king, who being then displeased with the pope, wished the parliament to remonstrate publicly with him on the excesses of the court of Rome. He was fully obeyed: the parliament was in its zenith, and defended the laws against papal rapacity. It showed, that in thirty years the court of Rome had extorted four millions six hundred and forty-five crowns from France. These multiplied simonies, these real thefts, committed under the name of *piety*, began to excite horror. The Roman court however having finally appeased and seduced Louis XI., he silenced those whom he had caused to speak so effectually. There was no remonstrance on the finances in the time of Louis XI. Charles VIII. or Louis XII.—for we must not qualify with the name of solemn remonstrances the refusal which this assembly made to lend Charles VIII. fifty thousand francs for his unfortunate expedition in Italy in 1496. The king sent the sire d'Albret, sire de Rieux, the governor of Paris, the sire de Graville, admiral of France, and cardinal Dumaine, to pray that it would tax itself to lend him this money. Strange deputation! The registers relate, that the parliament represented "the necessity and indigence of the kingdom and its so piteous case—quod non indiget manu scribentis." To keep its money was not one of its public remonstrances in the name of France.

It made one on St. Martin's silver screen, which Francis I. bought of the canons, and of which the

---

put down with a high hand—the former especially, whose appearance in one of these assemblies with a hunting whip in his hand is subsequently related. The idea of this right however lingered to the era of the revolution, and doubtless assisted other causes of indignation to produce it. The art of managing parliaments is now better understood, especially in Great Britain.—T.

Digitized by Google

principal and interest were laid on his domains. This is the first remonstrance on pecuniary affairs.

The second was on the sale of the offices of twenty new judges to the parliament of Paris, and of thirty in the provinces. It was the chancellor cardinal Duprat who thus prostituted justice. This shame lasted and extended on all the magistracy of France from 1515 to 1771, a space of two hundred and fifty-five years, until another chancellor began to efface it.

From this time, parliament remonstrated on all kinds of subjects. It was authorised to do so by the paternal edict of Louis XII., the father of his people—that the law should always be followed, notwithstanding the contrary orders which importunity may extort from the monarch.

After Francis I., the parliament was continually at war with the ministry, or at least at defiance. The unfortunate wars of religion augmented its credit; and the more it was necessary, the more enterprising it became. It regarded itself as the tutor of kings from the time of Francis I. Charles IX. reproaches it with this, in the time of his majority, in these words:—

"I command you not to act with a major king, as you have done during his minority; meddle not with affairs which it concerns you not to know; remember that your assembly has only been established by kings to render justice according to the ordinances of the sovereign. Leave affairs of state to the king and his council, correct yourselves of the error of regarding yourselves as the tutors of kings, the defenders of the kingdom, and the guardians of Paris."

The misfortunes of the times engaged it in the party of the League against Henry III. It sustained the Guises to such a point, that after the murders of Henry of Guise, and the cardinal his brother, it commenced proceedings against Henry III. and named two counsellors, Pichon and Courtin, to investigate the matter.*

* The sentence speaks only of the murderers of the duke of Guise and their accomplices. It was bold but not irregular.

Digitized by Google

After the death of Henry III. it declared against Henry the Great. Half of this body was induced by the faction of Spain, the other by a false zeal for religion.

Henry IV., like Charles VII., had another little parliament near him. Like him he entered into Paris more by secret negociations, than by force; and he united the two parliaments as Charles VII. had done.

All the ministry of cardinal Richelieu was signalised by frequent resistances of this assembly, resistances much stronger than were approved of by the nation.

The war of the Fronde, into which the parliament was precipitated by the factions, is well known. The queen-regent transferred it to Pontoise by a declaration of the king her son, already in his majority, dated the 3rd of July 1652. Three presidents only, and forty counsellors obeyed.

Louis XIV. in 1655, after the amnesty, went to the great chamber with a whip in his hand, to forbid assemblies of the chambers. In 1657 he ordered the registering of every edict, and permitted not remonstrances until a week after the registering. All was tranquil under his reign.*

Under Louis XV.

The parliament of Paris had already, from the time of the Fronde, established the custom of no longer rendering justice when it believed itself aggrieved by the government. It was a means which seemed to force the ministry to bend to its will, without incurring the reproach of rebellion, as in the minority of Louis XIV.

It employed this resource in 1718, in the minority of Louis XV. The duke of Orleans removed it to Pontoise in 1720.

The unfortunate bull Unigenitus sometimes caused it to quarrel with cardinal Fleuri.

It further ceased its functions in 1751, in the little troubles excited by Christopher de Beaumont, arch-

* No doubt; but what was the fact a reign or two after?—T.

Digitized by Google

bishop of Paris, on the subject of letters of confession, and the refusal of sacraments.

There was a new cessation of service in 1753. The whole body was exiled to several towns of its resort, the grand chamber to Pontoise. This exile lasted more than fifteen months, from the 10th of May 1753, to the 27th of August 1754. At this time the king caused justice to be rendered by counsellors of state and masters of requests. Very few causes were pleaded before this new tribunal. Most of those who had suits preferred accommodation, or waiting the return of the parliament. It seemed as if chicanery was exiled with those who were instituted to repress it.

The parliament was finally recalled to its functions, and returned with the acclamations of all France.

Two years after its return, the public mind being more soured than ever, the king held a court of justice at Paris in 1756, the 13th of December. He suppressed two chambers of parliament, and made several rules to institute a new police in this body. Scarcely was it dissolved, when all the judges gave in their resignations, except some presidents 'à mortier,' and ten judges of the grand chamber.

The court believed not then that it possessed the power of establishing a new tribunal in its place. The people were on all sides much soured, and very uncertain.

The inconceivable outrage of Damiens appeared for some time to reconcile parliament with the court. This unhappy man, no less insane than guilty, accused seven members of parliament in a letter which he dared to direct to the king himself, and which was carried to him. This absurd accusation prevented not the king from referring to the same parliament the judgment of Damiens, who was condemned to the punishment of Ravaillac, by those who remained of the grand chamber. Several peers and princes of the blood voted.

After the terrible execution of the criminal, performed on the 28th of March 1757, the ministry, engaged in a ruinous and fatal war, negociated with the same

Digitized by Google

officers of parliament who gave in their resignations; and the exiled were recalled.

This body, in consequence of having been humiliated by the court, had more authority than ever.

It signalised this authoritiy by an act abolishing the order of the jesuits in France, and by depriving them of all their property (by act of 6th of August, 1762). Nothing rendered it more dear to the nation. In this act it was perfectly seconded by all the parliaments of the kingdom, and by all France.

It united itself in fact with these other parliaments, and pretended to make only one body with them, of which it was the principal member. At first they were all called classes of parliament; that of Paris was the first class; each class made remonstrances on the edicts, and would not register them. There were even some of these bodies who prosecuted the commandants of provinces, sent to them by the king to cause them to be registered. Some classes decreed arrests against these officers, and if these decrees had been put into execution, a very strange effect would have resulted. It is on the royal domains that the money is obtained with which the expenses of justice are paid; so that the king would have paid from his own domains for sentences given by those who disobeyed him, against his principal officers, who had executed his orders.

The most singular of these sentences passed against the commandants of the provinces, was that of the parliament of Toulouse against the duke of Fitzjames, Berwick, dated the 17th of December 1763. It orders "That the said duke shall be taken, seized, and arrested, in whatever part of the kingdom he may be found;" that is to say, that the Toulousean officers and bailiffs might seize the body of the duke of Fitzjames, even in the king's chamber, or in his chapel at Versailles. The court long passed over this affront, and therefore provoked others.

This extraordinary anarchy could not exist; the crown must either have reassumed its authority, or the parliaments have prevailed.

In such critical junctures there was need of a chan-

Digitized by Google

cellor as bold as l'Hôpital; and he was found. It was necessary to change all the administration of justice in the kingdom; and it was changed.

The king commenced by endeavouring to bring back the parliament from Paris; and he called a court of justice, which he held at Versailles, the 7th of December 1770, with the princes, peers, and great officers of the crown. He there forbad them ever to make use of the terms unity, indivisibility, and classes—

To send to other parliaments other memorials than those specified by ordinances—

To cease the service, unless in cases which these same ordinances have foreseen—

To give in their resignation in a body—

Ever to give a sentence which retards the registerings. The whole under pain of dismissal.

The parliament, after this solemn edict, still ceasing service, the king sent them letters of command, which they disobeyed. New letters of command produced fresh disobedience, until at length the monarch, driven to the last extremity, as a last trial, at four o'clock in the morning of the 20th of January 1771, sent them a troop of musqueteers, who carried to each member a paper to sign. This paper contained merely an order to declare whether they would obey or refuse. Several wished to interpret the will of the king: the musqueteers told them that they had orders to avoid all comments, and that they must have a yes or no.

Forty members signed this yes; the others declined. The affirmatives, coming to parliament with their comrades the next day, demanded their pardon for having acceeded and signed no. All were exiled.*

Justice was again administered by councillors of state and masters of requests, as it had been in 1753; but it was only by provision. An useful arrangement will soon be extracted from this chaos.

The king then gave up to the wishes of the people,

* It is impossible to imagine a finer course of proceeding to ensure revolution, seeing it was evident that the people went heartily with the parliaments. The grand *coups* of despotism are often the proximate causes of its own destruction.—T.

Digitized by Google

who complained for ages of two grievances, of which the one was ruinous, the other at once shameful and burdensome. The first was the too great confinement of the parliament to Paris, which often caused citizens an hundred and fifty leagues distant to exceed their income in expense. The second was the venality of places of judicature, a venality which introduced the heavy taxation of judges' fees.

To reform these two abuses, six new parliaments were instituted on the 23rd of February of the same year, under the title of superior councils, with an injunction to render justice gratis. These councils were established (according to alphabetical order) in Arras, Blois, Châlons, Clermont, Lyons, and Poictiers; others have since been added.

Above all, a new parliament was to be formed at Paris, to be paid by the king, without the purchase of offices, or anything being exacted from the clients: this establishment was made the 13th of April 1771. The opprobrium of the venality with which Francis I. and chancellor Duprat unhappily stained France, was washed out by Louis XV. and the cares of chancellor de Maupeon, the second of the name. They concluded with the reform of all the parliaments, and hoped to see the reform of jurisprudence also. They were deceived: nothing was reformed; and Louis XVI. wisely re-established the parliaments which Louis XV. had put down. The people saw their return with transports of joy.

PARLIAMENT OF ENGLAND.

Members of the parliament of England like to compare themselves to the ancient Romans as much as they can.* It is not long since Mr. Shippen, in the house of commons, began his speech with these words: "The majesty of the English people would be wounded." The singularity of the expression caused a great burst of laughter; but without being disconcerted, he re-

* This article was written towards the year 1731.

Digitized by Google

peated the same words with a firm voice; and all were serious. I confess that I see nothing in common between the majesty of the English and that of the Roman people, and still less between their governments. There is a senate in London, some members of which are suspected, though wrongly no doubt,† of selling their voices on occasion as was done at Rome; that is all the resemblance. Besides, the two nations appear to me entirely different, both in good and evil. The horrible folly of religious wars was never known among the Romans: this abominaton was reserved for devotees, preachers of humility and patience. Marius and Sylla, Pompey and Cæsar, Anthony and Augustus, never fought to decide whether the flamen should wear his shirt under his gown, or his gown underneath his shirt, and whether the sacred fowls which were taken for augurs should eat and drink, or eat alone. The English formerly reciprocally hanged one another at their assizes, and were destroyed in pitched battles for quarrels of such a kind. The sects of episcopalians and presbyterians for a time turned their melancholy heads. I imagine that such a folly will never more happen to them; they appear to me to become wise at their own expense, and I now see in them no wish to cut one another's throats for syllogisms. Who can answer for men at all times? There is a more essential difference between Rome and England, which places all the advantage on the side of the latter; it is, that the fruit of the civil wars of Rome has been slavery, and that of the troubles of England liberty. The English nation is the only one on earth which either rules the power of kings by resisting them, and which by continued efforts has finally established this wise government, where the prince, all powerful in doing good, has his hands tied from doing evil; where lords are great without insolence or vassals; and where the people divide the government without confusion.

The houses of Lords and of Commons are the

* No doubt.—T.

Digitized by Google

arbiters of the nation; the king is the umpire. This balance was wanting to the Romans; the great and the multitude were always divided at Rome, unless there was a medium power which joined them. The senate of Rome, which had the unjust and punishable pride of not wishing to divide anything with the plebians, knew no other secret to keep them from the government than always occupying them in foreign wars. It regarded the people as a ferocious beast, whom they must let loose upon their neighbours, for fear it should devour its masters. Thus the greatest fault of the government of the Romans made them conquerors; it was because they were unhappy among themselves that they became the masters of the world until finally their divisions rendered them slaves.

The government of England is not constituted for so great an eclat, nor for so fatal an end; its aim is not the brilliant folly of making conquests, but to prevent its neighbours from making them. This people is not jealous of its own liberty alone; it is also jealous of that of others. The English were exasperated against Louis XIV. solely because they believed him to be ambitious.

Doubtless it has cost much to establish liberty in England; it is in seas of blood that they have drowned the idol of despotic power; but the English think not that they have bought their laws too dear. Other nations have not shed less blood than themselves, but the blood that they have shed has only confirmed their servitude.

What becomes a revolution in England, is but a sedition in other countries. A town takes arms to defend its privileges in Barbary or Turkey; mercenary soldiers soon conquer it, hangmen punish it, and the rest of the nation kiss their chains. The French think that the government of this island is more stormy than the sea which surrounds it; and that is true, but it is only when the king begins the tempest, and would render himself master of the vessel of which he is but first pilot. The civil wars of France have been lon-

Digitized by Google

ger, more cruel, and more fertile in crimes, than those of England; but of all these civil wars none has had a wise liberty for its object.* In the detestable times of Charles IX. and Henry III. they contended only to know if they should be the slaves of the Guises; as to the last war of Paris, it deserves only to be hissed at. They seem to me like scholars who mutiny against the prefect of a college, and who finish by being caned. Cardinal Retz, with much mind and ill-employed courage, rebelled without any object, was factious without a design, the chief of a party without an army, caballed for caballing's sake, and seemed to make civil war for his pleasure. The parliament of Paris knew not what he would do, nor what he would not; he raised troops by order and put them down again; menaced and asked pardon; he put a price on cardinal Mazarin's head, and afterwards went in ceremony to compliment him. Our civil wars under Charles VI. were cruel; those of the League were abominable; that of the Fronde was ridiculous.

The greatest reproach in France to the English, and with reason, is the punishment of Charles I.—a monarch worthy of a better lot, who was treated by his conquerors as he would have treated them, had he been fortunate. After all, regard on one side Charles I. vanquished in battle-array, a prisoner, tried, condemned in Westminster, and beheaded; and on the other, the emperor Henry VII. poisoned by his chaplain while receiving the sacrament—Henry III. assassinated by a monk—thirty meditated assassinations against Henry IV. several of which were attempted, and the last finally depriving France of this great king;—weigh these outrages, and judge.†

* This is almost as true since the revolution as before it, or when Voltaire wrote.—T.

† This is well put; but a certain class of defenders of religion and social order affect to see but one kind of crime against them.—T.

Digitized by Google

PASSIONS.

Their Influence upon the Body, and that of the Body upon them.

PRAY inform me, doctor—I do not mean a doctor of medicine, who really possesses some degree of knowledge, who has long examined the sinuosities of the brain, who has investigated whether there is a circulating fluid in the nerves, who has repeatedly and assiduously dissected the human matrix in vain, to discover something of the formation of thinking beings, and who, in short, knows all of our machine that can be known; alas! I mean a very different person, a doctor of theology;—I adjure you, by that reason at the very name of which you shudder, tell me why it is, that in consequence of your young and handsome housekeeper saying a few loving words, and giving herself a few coquettish airs, your blood becomes instantly agitated, and your whole frame thrown into a tumult of desire, which speedily leads to pleasures, of which neither herself nor you can explain the cause, but which terminate with the introduction into the world of a thinking being encrusted all over with original sin. Inform me, I entreat you, how the action tends to, or is connected with the result? You may read and re-read Sanchez and Thomas Aquinas, and Scot and Bonaventure, but you will never in consequence know an iota the more of that incomprehensible mechanism by which the eternal architect directs your ideas and your actions, and originates the little bastard of a priest predestined to damnation from all eternity.

On the following morning, when taking your chocolate, your memory retraces the image of pleasure which you experienced the evening before, and the scene and rapture are repeated. Have you any idea, my great automaton friend, what this same memory, which you possess in common with every species of animals, really is? Do you know what fibres recal your ideas, and paint in your brain the joys of the

Digitized by Google

evening, by a continuous sentiment, a consciousness, a personal identity which slept with you and awoke with you? The doctor replies, in the language of Thomas Aquinas, that all this is the work of his vegetative soul, his sensitive soul, and his intellectual soul, all three of which compose a soul which, although without extension itself, evidently acts on a body possessed of extension in course.

I perceive, by his embarrassed manner, that he has been stammering out words without a single idea; and I at length say to him, If you feel, doctor, that, however reluctantly, you must in your own mind admit that you do not know what a soul is, and that you have been talking all your life without any distinct meaning, why not acknowledge it like an honest man? Why do you not conclude the same as must be concluded from the physical premotion of doctor Boursier, and from certain passages of Malebranche, and, above all, from the acute and judicious Locke, so far superior to Malebranche,—why do you not, I say, conclude that your soul is a faculty which God has bestowed upon you without disclosing to you the secret of his process, as he has bestowed on you various others? Be assured, that many men of deep reflection maintain that, properly speaking, the unknown power of the divine artificer, and his unknown laws, alone perform everything in us; and that, to speak more correctly still, we shall never know in fact anything at all about the matter.

The doctor at this becomes agitated and irritated; the blood rushes into his face; if he had been stronger than myself, and had not been restrained by a sense of decency, he would certainly have struck me. His heart swells; the systole and diastole are interrupted in their regular operation; his brain is compressed; and he falls down in a fit of apoplexy. What connection could there be between this blood, and heart, and brain, and an old opinion of the doctor contrary to my own? Does a pure intellectual spirit fall into syncope when another is of a different opinion? I have uttered certain sounds; he has uttered certain sounds; and

Digitized by Google

behold! he falls down in apoplexy—he drops down dead!

I am sitting at table, "prima mensis," in the first of the month, myself and my soul, at the Sorbonne, with five or six doctors, "socii sorbonnici," fellows of the institution. We are served with bad and adulterated wine; at first our souls are elevated and maddened; half an hour afterwards our souls are stupified, and as it were annihilated; and on the ensuing morning these same worthy doctors issue a grand decree, deciding that the soul, although occupying no place, let it be remembered, and absolutely immaterial,—is lodged in the "corpus callosum" of the brain, in order to pay their court to surgeon La Peyronie.

A guest is sitting at table full of conversation and gaiety. A letter is brought him that overwhelms him with astonishment, grief, and apprehension. Instantly the muscles of his abdomen contract and relax with extraordinary violence, the peristaltic motion of the intestines is augmented, the sphincter of the rectum is opened by the convulsions which agitate his frame, and the unfortunate gentleman, instead of finishing his dinner in comfort, produces a copious evacuation. Tell me then what secret connection nature has established between an idea and a water-closet.

Of all those persons who have undergone the operation of trepanning, a great proportion always remain imbecile. Of course therefore the thinking fibres of their brain have been injured; but where are these thinking fibres? Oh Sanchez! Oh masters de Grillandis, Tamponet, Riballier! Oh Cogé-Pecus, second regent and rector of the university, do give me a clear, decisive, and satisfactory explanation of all this, if you possibly can!

While I was writing this article at mount Krapak for my own private improvement, a book was brought to me called "The Medicine of the Mind," by doctor Camus, professor of medicine in the university of Paris. I was in hopes of finding in this book a solution of all my difficulties. But what was it that I found in fact? Just nothing at all. Ah! master Ca-

Digitized by Google

mus, you have not displayed much mind in preparing your Medicine of the Mind. This person strongly recommends the blood of an ass, drawn from behind the ear, as a specific against madness. "The virtue of the blood of an ass," he says, "re-establishes the soul in its functions." He maintains also, that madmen are cured by giving them the itch. He asserts likewise, that in order to gain or strengthen a memory, the meat of capons, leverets, and larks, is of eminent service, and that onions and butter ought to be avoided above all things. This was printed in 1769 with the king's approbation and privilege; and there really were people who consigned their health to the keeping of master Camus, professor of medicine! Why was he not made first physician to the king?

Poor puppets of the Eternal Artificer, who know neither why nor how an invisible hand moves all the springs of our machine, and at length packs us away in our wooden box! We constantly see more and more reason for repeating, with Aristotle, "All is occult, all is secret."

PAUL.

SECTION I.

Questions concerning Paul.

Was Paul a Roman citizen, as he boasted? If he was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, Tarsus was not a Roman colony until an hundred years after his death; upon this point all antiquaries are agreed. If he belonged to the little town or village of Gescala, as St. Jerome believed, this town was in Galilee, and certainly the Galileans were not Roman citizens.

Is it true, that St. Paul entered into the rising society of Christians, who at that time were demi-jews, only because Gamaliel, whose disciple he was, refused him his daughter in marriage? It appears that this accusation is to be found exclusively in the Acts of the Apostles, which are received by the Ebionites, and refuted by the bishop Epiphanius in his thirtieth chapter.

Digitized by Google

Is it true, that St. Thecla sought St. Paul in the disguise of a man, and are the acts of St. Thecla admissible? Tertullian, in the thirteenth chapter of his book on Baptism, maintains that this history was composed by a priest attached to Paul. Jerome and Cyprian, in refuting the story of the lion baptized by St. Thecla, affirm the genuineness of these acts, in which we find that singular portrait of St. Paul, which we have already recorded. "He was fat, short, and broad shouldered; his dark eyebrows united across his aquiline nose; his legs were crooked, his head bald, and he was full of the grace of the Lord." This is pretty nearly his portrait in the Philopatris of Lucian, with the exception of the 'grace of God,' with which Lucian unfortunately had no acquaintance.

Is Paul to be reprehended for his reproof of the judaising of St. Peter, who himself judaised for eight days together in the temple of Jerusalem?

When Paul was traduced before the governor of Judea, for having introduced strangers into the temples, was it proper for him to say to the governor, that he was prosecuted on account of his teaching the resurrection of the dead, whilst of the resurrection of the dead nothing was said at all?*

Did Paul do right in circumcising his disciple Timothy, after having written to the Galatians, that "If they circumcised, Jesus would not avail them?"

Was it well to write to the Corinthians, chap. ix. "Have we not power to eat and drink at your expence? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, &c.?" Was it proper to write in his second epistle to the Corinthians, that he will pardon none of them, neither those who have sinned nor others? What should we think at present of a man who pretended to live at our expense, himself and his wife; and to judge and to punish us, confounding the innocent with the guilty?

What are we to understand by the ascension of Paul into the third heaven?—what is the third heaven?

* Acts, chap. xxiv.

Digitized by Google

Which is the most probable (humanly speaking)—did St. Paul become a christian in consequence of being thrown from a horse by the appearance of a great light at noon day, from which a celestial voice exclaimed—"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Or was it in consequence of being irritated against the pharisees, either by the refusal of Gamaliel to give him his daughter, or by some other cause?

In all other history, the refusal of Gamaliel would appear more probable than the celestial voice; especially if, moreover, we were not obliged to believe in this miracle.

I only ask these questions in order to be instructed; and I request all those who are willing to instruct me to speak reasonably.

SECTION II.

The Epistles of St. Paul are so sublime, it is often difficult to understand them.

Many young bachelors demand the precise signification of the following words:—"Every man praying or prophecying, having his covered head, dishonoureth his head."*

What does he mean by the words—"I have learned from the Lord, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread?"†

How could he learn anything from that Jesus Christ to whom he had never spoken, and to whom he had been a most cruel enemy, without ever having seen him? Was it by inspiration, or by the recital of the apostles; or did he learn it when the celestial light caused him to fall from his horse? He does not inform us on this point.

The following again:—"The woman shall be saved in childbearing."‡

This is certainly to encourage population;—it appears not that St. Paul founded convents.

He speaks of seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; of those whose consciences are seared as with

* 1 Cor. xi. 4. † Ibid. v. 23. ‡ Timothy ii.

Digitized by Google

a red-hot iron, who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats.*

This is very strong. It appears that he abjured monks, nuns, and fast-days. Explain this contradiction; deliver me from this cruel embarrassment.

What is to be said of the passage in which he recommends the bishops to have one wife?—"Unius uxoris virum."†

This is positive. He permits the bishops to have but one wife, whilst the Jewish pontiffs might have several.

He says unequivocally, that the last judgment will happen during his own time, that Jesus will descend from on high, as described by St. Luke, and that St. Paul and the righteous inhabitants of Thessalonica will be caught up to him in the air, &c.‡

Has this occurred; or is it an allegory, a figure? Did he actually believe that he should make this journey, or that he had been caught up into the third heaven? Which is the third heaven? How will he ascend into the air? Has he been there?

"That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of glory, may give you the spirit of wisdom."§

Is this acknowledging Jesus to be the same God as the Father?

He has manifested his power over Jesus, "when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand."‖

Does this constitute the divinity of Jesus?

"Thou madest him (Jesus) a little lower than angels; thou crownedst him with glory."¶

If he is inferior to angels—is he God?

"For if by one man's offence death reigned, much more they who receive of the abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ."**

---

* Timothy, iv.
† Ibid. iii. and Titus, i.
‡ 1 Thessal. iv.
§ Ephes. i. 17.
‖ Ephes. i. 20.
¶ Hebrews, ii. 7.
** Romans, v. 12.

Digitized by Google

Almost man and never God, except in a single passage contested by Erasmus, Grotius, Le Clerc, &c.

"Children of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ."*

Is not this constantly regarding Jesus as one of us, although superior by the grace of God?

"To God, alone wise, honour and glory, through Jesus Christ."

How are we to understand these passages literally, without fearing to offend Jesus Christ; or, in a more extended sense, without the risk of offending God the Father?

There are many more passages of this kind, which exercise the sagacity of the learned. The commentators differ, and we pretend not to possess any light which can remove the obscurity. We submit with heart and mouth to the decision of the church.

We have also taken some trouble to penetrate into the meaning of the following passages:—

"For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keepest the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision."†

"Now we know, that whatever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that any mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified; for by the law is the knowledge of sin..... Seeing that it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law, through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."‡

"For if Abraham was justified by his works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God."§

We fear that even the ingenuous and profound Dom Calmet himself gives us not upon these somewhat obscure passages a light which dissipates all our darkness. It is without doubt our own fault that we do not understand the commentators, and are deprived of

* Romans, viii. 17.
† Ibid. ii. 25.
‡ Romans, iii. 19, 20, 30, 31.
§ Ibid. iv. 2.

Digitized by Google

that complete conception of the text, which is given only to privileged souls. As soon however as an explanation shall come from the chair of truth, we shall comprehend the whole perfectly.

SECTION III.

Let us add this little supplement to the article Paul. It is better to edify ourselves with the Epistles of this apostle, than to weaken our piety by calumniating the times and persons for which they were written. The learned search in vain for the year and the day in which St. Paul assisted to stone St. Stephen, and to guard the mantles of his executioners.

They dispute on the year in which he was thrown from his horse by a miraculous light at noon-day, and on the epoch of his being borne away into the third heaven.

They can agree neither upon the year in which he was conducted to Rome, nor that in which he died.

They are unacquainted with the date of any of his letters.

Saint Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle to Philemon says, that Paul might signify the embouchure of a flute.

The letters of St. Paul to Seneca, and from Seneca to Paul, were accounted as authentic in the primitive ages of the church, as all the rest of the Christian writings. St. Jerome asserts their authenticity, and quotes passages from these letters in his catalogue. St. Augustin doubts them not in his 153d letter to Macedonius.* We have thirty letters of these two great men, Paul and Seneca, who, it is pretended, were linked together by a strict friendship in the court of Nero. The seventh letter from Paul to Seneca is very curious. He tells him, that the Jews and the christians were often burnt as incendiaries at Rome. Christiani et Judæi tanquam machinatores incendii supplicio affici solent. It is in fact probable, that the Jews and the Christians, whose mutual enmity was

* Benedictine Edition, and in "The City of God," book vi.

Digitized by Google

extremely violent, reciprocally accused each other of setting the city on fire; and that the scorn and horror felt towards the Jews, with whom the christians were usually confounded, rendered them equally the objects of public suspicion and vengeance.

We are obliged to acknowledge, that the epistolary correspondence of Seneca and Paul is in a ridiculous and barbarous Latin; that the subjects of these letters are as inconsistent as the style; and that at present they are regarded as forgeries. But then may we venture to contradict the testimony of St. Jerome and St. Augustin? If writings, attested by them, are nothing but vile impostures, how shall we be certain of the authenticity of others more respectable? Such is the important objection of many learned personages. If we are unworthily deceived, say they, in relation to the Letters of Paul and Seneca on the Apostolical Institutes, and the Acts of St. Peter, why may we not be equally imposed upon by the Acts of the Apostles? The decision of the church and faith are unequivocal answers to all these researches of science and suggestions of the understanding.

It is not known upon what foundation Abdias, first bishop of Babylon, says, in his History of the Apostles, that St. Paul caused St. James the Less to be stoned by the people. Before he was converted however, he might as readily persecute St. James as St. Stephen. He was certainly very violent, because it is said in the Acts of the Apostles, that he "breathed threatenings and slaughter." Abdias has also taken care to observe, that the mover of the sedition in which St. James was so cruelly treated, was the same Paul whom God had since called to the apostleship.

This book, attributed to Abdias, is not admitted into the canon; but Julius Africanus, who has translated it into Latin, believes it to be authentic. Since however the church has not admitted it, *we* must not admit it. Let us content ourselves with adoring Providence, and wishing that all persecutors were transformed into charitable and compassionate apostles.

Digitized by Google

PERSECUTION.

I WILL not call Dioclesian a persecutor, for he protected the christians for eighteen years; and if, during his latter days, he did not save them from the resentment of Galerius, he only furnished the example of a prince seduced, like many others, by intrigue and cabal, into a conduct unworthy of his character.

I will still less give the name of persecutor to Trajan or Antoninus. I should regard myself as uttering blasphemy.

What is a persecutor? He whose wounded pride and fanaticism irritate princes and magistrates into fury against innocent men, whose only crime is that of being of a different opinion. Impudent man! thou hast worshipped God; thou hast preached and practised virtue; thou hast served and assisted man; thou hast protected the orphan, hast succoured the poor; thou hast changed deserts, in which slaves dragged on a miserable existence, into fertile districts peopled with happy families; but I have discovered that thou despisest me, and hast never read my controversial work. I will therefore seek the confessor of the prime minister, or the magistrate; I will show them, with outstretched neck and twisted mouth, that thou holdest an erroneous opinion in relation to the cells in which the septuagint was studied; that thou hast even spoken disrespectfully for these ten years past of Tobit's dog, which thou assertest to have been a spaniel, whilst I maintain that it was a greyhound. I will denounce thee as the enemy of God and man! Such is the language of the persecutor; and if these words do not precisely issue from his lips, they are engraven on his heart with the graver of fanaticism steeped in the gall of envy.

It was thus that the Jesuit le Tellier dared to persecute cardinal de Noailles, and that Jurieu persecuted Bayle.

When the persecution of the protestants commenced in France, it was not Francis I. nor Henry II. nor Fran-

Digitized by Google

cis II. who sought out these unfortunate people, who hardened themselves against them with reflective bitterness, and who delivered them to the flames in the spirit of vengeance. Francis I. was too much engaged with the duchess D'Etampes; Henry II. with his ancient Diana, and Francis II. was too much a child. Who then commenced these persecutions? Jealous priests, who enlisted in their service the prejudices of magistrates and the policy of ministers.

If these monarchs had not been deceived, if they had foreseen that these persecutions would produce half a century of civil war, and that the two parts of the nation would mutually exterminate each other, they would have extinguished with their tears the first piles which they allowed to be lighted.

Oh God of mercy! If any man can resemble that malignant being who is described as actually employed in the destruction of thy works, is it not the persecutor?

PETER (SAINT).

Why have the successors of St. Peter possessed so much power in the west and none in the east? This is just the same as to ask why the bishops of Wurtzburg and Saltzburg obtained for themselves regal prerogatives in a period of anarchy, while the Greek bishops always remained subjects. Time, opportunity, the ambition of some, and the weakness of others, have done and will do everything in the world. We always except what relates to religion.

To this anarchy must be added opinion; and opinion is the queen of mankind. Not that, in fact, they have any very clear and definite opinion of their own, but words answer the same end with them.

"I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." The zealous partizans of the bishop of Rome contended, about the eleventh century, that whoever gives the greater gives the less; that heaven surrounded the earth; and that as Peter had the keys of the container he had also the keys of what was con-

Digitized by Google

tained. If by heaven we understand all the stars and planets, it is evident, according to Tomasius, that the keys given to Simon Barjonas, surnamed Peter, were an universal passport. If we understand by heaven the clouds, the atmosphere, the ether, and the space in which the planets revolve, no smith in the world, as Meursius observes, could ever make a key for such gates as these. Railleries however are not reasons.

Keys in Palestine were wooden latches with strings to them. Jesus says to Barjonas, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." The pope's clergy concluded from these words, that the popes had received authority to bind and unbind the people's oath of fidelity to their kings, and to dispose of kingdoms at their pleasure. This certainly was concluding magnificently. The Commons in the States General of France, in 1302, say in their memorial to the king that "Boniface VIII. was a b— for believing that God bound and imprisoned in heaven what Boniface bound on earth." A famous German Lutheran (the great Melancthon) could not endure the idea of Jesus having said to Simon Barjonas, Cepha or Cephas, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock* will I build my assembly, my church." He could not conceive that God would use such a play of words, and that the power of the pope could have been established upon a pun. Such a doubt however can be indulged only by a protestant.

Peter has been considered as having been bishop of Rome; but it is well known that in the apostolic age, and long after, there was no particular and appropriate bishopric. The society of christians did not assume a regular form until about the middle of the second century. It may be true that Peter went to Rome, and even that he was crucified with his head downwards, although that was not the usual mode of crucifixion; but we have no proof whatever of all this. We have a letter under his name, in which he says that he is at

* *Petris* in Latin signifies a *rock*, besides being a proper name.—T.

Digitized by Google

Babylon: acute and shrewd canonists have contended that by Babylon we ought to understand Rome; and upon the same principle, if he had dated at Rome, we might have concluded that the letter had been written at Babylon. Men have long been in the habit of drawing such reasonable and judicious inferences as these; and it is in this manner that the world has been governed.

There was once a clergyman who, after having been made to pay extortionately for a benefice at Rome, an offence known by the name of simony, happened to be asked some time afterwards, whether he thought Simon Peter had ever been in that city? He replied, "I do not think that Peter was ever there, but I am sure Simon was."

With respect to the personal character and behaviour of St. Peter, it must be acknowledged that Paul is not the only one who was scandalized at his conduct. He was often "withstood to the face," as well as his successors. St. Paul vehemently reproached him with eating forbidden meats, that is pork, blood pudding, hare, eels, the ixion, and the griffin; Peter vindicated himself by saying, that he had seen heaven opened about the sixth hour, and as it were a great sheet descending from the four corners of it, which was filled with creeping things, quadrupeds, and birds, while the voice of an angel called out to him, saying, "Kill and eat." This, says Woolston, seems to have been the same voice which has called out to so many pontiffs since, "Kill everything; eat up the substance of the people." But this reproach is much too strong.

Casaubon cannot by any means bring himself to approve the manner in which St. Peter treated Ananias and Sapphira his wife. "By what right," says Casaubon, "did a Jew slave of the Romans order or permit, that all those who believed in Jesus should sell their inheritance, and lay down the price paid for it at his feet?" If an anbaptist at London was to order all the money belonging to his brethren to be brought and laid at his feet, would he not be apprehended as a seditious seducer, as a thief who would certainly be hanged

Digitized by Google

at Tyburn? Was it not abominable to kill Ananias, because, after having sold his property and delivered over the bulk of the produce to Peter, he had retained for himself and his wife a few crowns for any case of necessity, without mentioning it? Scarcely, moreover, has Ananias expired, before his wife arrives. Peter, instead of warning her charitably that he had just destroyed her husband by apoplexy for having kept back a few oboli, and cautioning her therefore to look well to herself, leads her as it were intentionally into the snare. He asks her if her husband has given all his money to the saints; the poor woman replies in the affirmative, and dies instantly. This is certainly rather severe.

Corringius asks, why Peter, who thus killed the persons that had given him alms and showed him kindness, did not rather go and destroy all the learned doctors who had brought Jesus Christ to the cross, and who more than once brought a scourging on himself? "Oh Peter!" says Corringius, "you put to death two christians who bestowed alms on you, and at the same time suffer those to live who crucified your God!"

In the reigns of Henry IV. and Louis XIII. we had an advocate-general of the parliament of Provence, a man of quality, called d'Oraison de Torame, who, in a book respecting the church militant, dedicated to Henry IV., has appropriated a whole chapter to the sentences pronounced by St. Peter in criminal causes. He says, that the sentence pronounced by Peter on Ananias and Sapphira was executed by God himself, "in the very terms and forms of spiritual jurisdiction." His whole book is in the same strain; but Corringius, as we perceive, is of a different opinion from that of our sagacious and liberal provincial advocate. It is pretty evident, that Corringius was not in the country of the inquisition when he published his bold remarks.

Erasmus, in relation to St. Peter, remarked a somewhat curious circumstance, which is, that the chief of the christian religion began his apostleship with denying Jesus Christ, and that the first pontiff of the Jews

Digitized by Google

commenced his ministry by making a golden calf and worshipping it.

However that may be, Peter is described as a poor man instructing the poor. He resembles those founders of orders who lived in indigence, and whose successors have become great lords and even princes.

The pope, the successor of Peter, has sometimes gained and sometimes lost; but there are still about fifty millions of persons in the world submitting in many points to his laws, besides his own immediate subjects.

To obtain a master three or four hundred leagues from home; to suspend your own opinion and wait for what he puts forth as his; not to dare to give a final decision on a cause relating to certain of our fellow citizens, but through commissioners appointed by this stranger; not to dare to take possession of certain fields and vineyards granted by our own sovereign, without paying a considerable sum to this foreign master; to violate the laws of our country, which prohibit a man's marriage with his niece, and marry her legitimately by giving this foreign master a sum still more considerable than the former one; not to dare to cultivate one's field on the day this stranger is inclined to celebrate the memory of some unknown person whom he has chosen to introduce into heaven by his own sole authority;—such are a part only of the conveniences and comforts of admitting the jurisdiction of a pope: such, if we may believe Marsais, are the liberties of the Gallican church.

There are some other nations that carry their submission further. We have, in our own time, actually known a sovereign request permission of the pope to try in his own courts certain monks accused of parricide, and able neither to obtain this permission nor to venture on such trial without it!

It is well known that formerly the power of the popes extended further. They were far above the gods of antiquity; for the latter were merely supposed to dispose of empires, but the popes disposed of them in

Digitized by Google

Sturbinus says, that we may pardon those who entertain doubts of the divinity and infallibility of the pope, when we reflect—

That forty schisms have profaned the chair of St. Peter, twenty-seven of which have been marked by blood—

That Stephen VII., the son of a priest, disinterred the corpse of Formosus his predecessor, and had the head of it cut off—

That Sergius III., convicted of assassinations, had a son by Marozia, who inherited the popedom—

That John X., the paramour of Theodora, was strangled in her bed—

That John XI., son of Sergius III., was known only by his gross intemperance—

That John XII. was assassinated in the apartments of his mistress—

That Benedict IX. both bought and sold the pontificate—

That Gregory VII. was the author of five hundred years of civil war, carried on by his successors—

That finally, among so many ambitious, sanguinary, and debauched popes, there was an Alexander VI. whose name is pronounced with the same horror as those of Nero and Caligula.

It is, we are told, a proof of the divinity of their character, that it has subsisted in connection with so many crimes; but according to this, if the caliphs had displayed still more atrocious and abominable conduct, they would have been still more divine. This argument, inferring their divinity from their wickedness, is urged by Dermius. He has been properly answered; but the best reply is to be found in the mitigated authority which the bishops of Rome at present exercise with discretion; in the long possession which the emperors permit them to enjoy, because in fact they are unable to deprive them of it; and in the system of the balance of power, which is watched with jealousy by every court in Europe.

It has been contended, and very lately, that there are only two nations which could invade Ita-

Digitized by Google

crush Rome. These are the Turks and Russians; but they are necessarily enemies; and besides, I cannot distinctly anticipate misfortunes so distant.

Je ne sais point prevoir les malheurs de si loin.
RACINE, Andromache, act i. scene 2.

PETER THE GREAT AND J. J. ROUSSEAU.

"The czar Peter . . . . had not true genius—that which creates and makes all of nothing. Some things which he did were good: the greater part were misplaced. He saw that his people were barbarous; he has not seen that they were not prepared for polishing; he would civilise them when they only wanted training. He wished at once to make Germans and English when he should have commenced by making Russians. He prevented his subjects from becoming what they might be, by persuading them that they were what they are not. It is thus that a French preceptor forms his pupil to shine for a moment in his childhood, and never afterwards to be anything. The empire of Russia would subjugate Europe, and will be subjugated itself. The Tartars, its subjects or neighbours, will become its masters and ours. This revolution appears to me unavoidable: all the kings of Europe labour together to accelerate it."* (Contrat Social, livre ii.

* To judge of a prince, we must transport ourselves back to the time in which he lived. If Rousseau, by saying that Peter I. had not true genius, means, that this prince has not created principles of legislation and public administration—principles then absolutely unknown in Europe, such a reproach does not tarnish his glory. The czar saw that his soldiers were without discipline, and he gave them that of the most warlike nations of Europe. His people were ignorant of navigation, and in a few years he created a formidable fleet. For commerce, he adopted the principles of the people who then passed for the most enlightened in Europe. He felt that the Russians only differed from other Europeans from three causes: the first was the excessive power of superstition over their minds, and the influence of priests over the government and subjects. The czar attacked superstition at its source, by destroying the monks by the gentlest method, that of not permitting the vows until an age in which every man who had an inclination to take them was to a certainty an useless citizen.

He rendered priests subject to the law, and left them only as

Digitized by Google

chap. viii.) These words are extracted from a pamphlet entitled the "Contrat Social," or unsocial, of the very unsociable Jean Jacques Rousseau. It is not astonishing, that having performed miracles at Venice he should prophecy on Moscow; but as he well knows that the good time of miracles and prophecies has passed away, he ought to believe, that his prediction against Russia is not so infallible as it appeared to him in his first fit of divination. It is pleasant to announce the fall of great empires; it consoles us for our littleness. It

---

authority subordinate to his own, in reference to objects of civil order, which the ignorance of our ancestors submitted exclusively to ecclesiastical power.

The second cause which was opposed to the civilization of Russia, was the almost general slavery of the peasants, whether artisans or farmers. Peter dared not immediately destroy servitude; but he prepared for its destruction, by forming an army which rendered him independent of proprietors of lands, and put him in a state to fear them no longer; and by creating in his new capital, by means of foreigners invited into his empire, a trading and industrious people enjoying civil liberty.

The third cause of the barbarity of the Russians was ignorance. He felt that he could only render his nation powerful by enlightening it, and this was the principal object of his labours. It is above all in this that he has shown a true genius: we cannot be sufficiently astonished at seeing Rousseau reproach him with not confining himself to training his nation; and it must be confessed, that the Russian who in 1700 perceived the influence of knowledge on the political state of empires, and could discover that the greatest good he could do to men was to substitute just ideas for the prejudices which governed them, had more genius than the Genevese who in 1750 wished to prove to us the great advantages of ignorance.

When Peter mounted the throne, Russia was nearly in the same state as France, Germany, and England in the eleventh century. The Russians, so far as the views of Peter have been followed, have made, in eighty years, more progress than we did in four centuries. Is not this a proof that these views were not those of an ordinary man?

As to the prophecy on the future conquests of the Tartars, Rousseau should have observed, that barbarians have never conquered civilised people, except when these latter have neglected tactics; and that the former have always been too few to vanquish great nations which have armies. There is a wide difference between dethroning a despot; puting yourself in his place, imposing a tribute on him after having conquered him, and subjugating a people. The Romans conquered Gaul and Spain: the chiefs of the Goths and Franks only drove away the Romans, and succeeded them.

Digitized by Google

will be a fine gain for philosophy, when we shall constantly behold the Nogais Tartars, who can, I believe, bring twelve thousand men into the field, coming to subjugate Russia, Germany, Italy, and France. But I flatter myself, that the emperor of China, will not suffer it; he has already acceded to perpetual peace, and as he has no more jesuits about him, he will not trouble Europe. Jean Jacques, who possesses, as he himself believes, true genius, finds that Peter the Great had it not.

A Russian Lord, a man of much wit, who sometimes amuses himself with reading pamphlets, while reading this, remembered some lines of Molière, implying, that three miserable authors took it into their heads, that it was only necessary to be printed and bound in calf, to become important personages and dispose of empires:—

> Il semble à trois gredins, dans leur petit cerveau,
> Que, pour être imprimés et reliés in veau,
> Les voilà dans l'état d'importantes personnes,
> Qu'avec leur plume ils font le destin des couronnes.

The Russians, says Jean Jacques, were never polished. I have seen some at least very polite, and who had just, delicate, agreeable, cultivated, and even logical minds, which Jean Jacques will find very extraordinary.

As he is very gallant, he will not fail to say, that they are formed at the court of the empress of Russia, that her example has influenced them: but that prevents not the correctness of his prophecy—that this empire will soon be destroyed.

This good little man assures us, in one of his modest works, that a statue should be erected to him. It will not probably be either at Moscow or Petersburg, that any one will trouble himself to sculpture Jean Jacques.

I wish, in general, that when people judge of nations from their garrets, they would be more honest and circumspect. Every poor devil can say what he pleases of the Romans, Athenians, and ancient Persians. He can deceive himself with impunity on the tribunes,

Digitized by Google

comitias, and dictatorships. He can govern in idea two or three thousand leagues of country, whilst he is incapable of governing his servant girl. In a romance, he can receive "an acrid kiss" from his Julia, and advise a prince to espouse the daughter of a hangman. These are follies without consequence—there are others which may have disastrous effects.

Court fools were very discreet; they insulted the weak alone by their buffooneries, and respected the powerful: country fools are at present more bold.

It will be answered, that Diogenes and Aretin were tolerated. Granted; but a fly one day seeing a swallow wing away with a spider's web, would do the same thing, and was taken.

SECTION II.

May we not say of these legislators who govern the universe at two sous the sheet, and who from their garrets give orders to all kings, what Homer said to Calchas?—

> Os ede ta eonta, ta te essomena, pro theonta.
>
> He knew the past, present, and future.

It is a pity that the author of the little paragraph which we are going to quote knew nothing of the three times of which Homer speaks.

"Peter the Great," says he, "had not the genius which makes all of nothing." Truly, Jean Jacques, I can easily believe it; for it is said that God alone has this prerogative.

"He has not seen that his people were not prepared for polishing."

In this case it was admirable of the czar to prepare them. It appears to me, that it is Jean Jaques who has not seen that he must make use of the Germans and English to form Russians.

"He has prevented his subjects from ever becoming what they might be," &c.

Yet these same Russians have become the conquerors of the Turks and Tartars, the conquerors and legislators of the Crimea, and twenty different nations.

Digitized by Google

Their sovereign has given laws to nations of which even the names were unknown in Europe.

As to the prophecy of Jean Jacques, he may have exalted his soul sufficiently to read the future. He has all the requisites of a prophet; but as to the past and the present, it must be confessed that he knows nothing about them. I doubt whether antiquity has anything comparable to the boldness of sending four squadrons from the extremity of the Baltic into the seas of Greece—of reigning at once over the Egean and the Euxine seas—of carrying terror into Colchis, and to the Dardanelles—of subjugating Taurida, and forcing the vizier Azem to fly from the shores of the Danube to the gates of Adrianople.

If Jean Jacques considers so many great actions which astonished the attentive world as nothing, he must at least confess, that there was some generosity in one count Orloff, who having taken a vessel which contained all the family and treasures of a pacha, sent him back both his family and treasures. If the Russians were not prepared for polishing in the time of Peter the Great, let us agree that they are now prepared for greatness of soul; and that Jean Jacques is not quite prepared for truth and reasoning.

With regard to the future, we shall know it when we have Ezekiels, Isaiahs, Habakkuks, and Micahs; but their time has passed away; and if we dare say so much, it is to be feared that it will never return.

I confess that these lies, printed in relation to present times, always astonish me. If these liberties are allowed in an age in which a thousand volumes, a thousand newspapers and journals, are constantly correcting each other, what faith can we have in those histories of ancient times, which collected all vague rumours without consulting any archives, which put into writing all that they had heard told by their grandmothers in their childhood, very sure that no critic would dicover their errors?

We had for a long time nine muses: wholesome criticism is the tenth, which has appeared very lately. She existed not in the time of Cecrops, of the first

Digitized by Google

Bacchus, or of Sanchoniathon, Thaut, Bramah, &c. People then wrote all they liked with impunity. At present we must be a little more careful.

PHILOSOPHER.

SECTION I.

PHILOSOPHER, 'lover of wisdom,' that is, 'of truth.' All philosophers have possessed this two-fold character; there is not one among those of antiquity who did not give examples of virtue to mankind, and lessons of moral truth. They might be mistaken, and undoubtedly were so, on subjects of natural philosophy; but that is of comparatively so little importance to the conduct of life, that philosophers had then no need of it. Ages were required to discover a part of the laws of nature. A single day is sufficient to enable a sage to become acquainted with the duties of man.

The philosopher is no enthusiast; he does not set himself up for a prophet; he does not represent himself as inspired by the gods. I shall not therefore place in the rank of philosophers the ancient Zoroaster, or Hermes, or Orpheus, or any of those legislators in whom the nations of Chaldea, Persia, Syria, Egypt, and Greece made their boast. Those who called themselves the sons of gods were the fathers of imposture; and if they employed falsehood to inculcate truths, they were unworthy of inculcating them; they were not philosophers; they were at best only prudent liars.

By what fatality, disgraceful perhaps to the nations of the west, has it happened that we are obliged to travel to the extremity of the east, in order to find a sage of simple manners and character, without arrogance and without imposture, who taught men how to live happy six hundred years before our era, at a period when the whole of the north was ignorant of the use of letters, and when the Greeks had scarcely begun to distinguish themselves by wisdom? That sage is Confucius, who deemed too highly of his character as a legislator

Digitized by Google

for mankind, to stoop to deceive them. What finer rule of conduct has ever been given since his time, throughout the earth?

"Rule a state as you rule a family; a man cannot govern his family well without giving a good example.

"Virtue should be common to the labourer and the monarch.

"Be active in preventing crimes, that you may lessen the trouble of punishing them.

"Under the good kings Yao and Xu, the Chinese were good; under the bad kings Kie and Chu, they were wicked.

"Do to another as to thyself.

"Love mankind in general, but cherish those who are good. Forget injuries, but never benefits.

"I have seen men incapable of the sciences, but never any incapable of virtue."

Let us acknowledge, that no legislator ever announced to the world more useful truths.

A multitude of Greek philosophers taught afterwards a morality equally pure. Had they distinguished themselves only by their vain systems of natural philosophy, their names would be mentioned at the present day only in derision. If they are still respected, it is because they were just, and because they taught mankind to be so.

It is impossible to read certain passages of Plato, and particularly the admirable exordium of the laws of Zaleucus, without experiencing an ardent love of honourable and generous actions. The Romans have their Cicero, who alone is perhaps more valuable than all the philosophers of Greece. After him come men more respectable still, but whom we may almost despair of imitating; these are Epictetus in slavery, and the Antonines and Julian upon a throne.

Where is the citizen to be found among us who would deprive himself, like Julian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius, of all the refined accommodations of our delicate and luxurious modes of living? Who would, like them, sleep on the bare ground? Who

Digitized by Google

would restrict himself to their frugal habits? Who would, like them, march bare headed and bare-footed at the head of the armies, exposed sometimes to the burning sun, and at other times to the freezing blast? Who would, like them, keep perfect mastery of all his passions? We have among us devotees, but where are the sages? where are the souls just and tolerant, serene and undaunted?

There have been some philosophers of the closet in France; and all of them, with the exception of Montaigne, have been persecuted. It seems to me the last degree of malignity that our nature can exhibit, to attempt to oppress those who devote their best endeavours to correct and improve it.

I can easily conceive of the fanatics of one sect slaughtering those of another sect; that the franciscans should hate the dominicans, and that a bad artist should cabal and intrigue for the destruction of an artist that surpasses him; but that the sage Charron should have been menaced with the loss of life; that the learned and noble-minded Ramus should have been actually assassinated; that Descartes should have been obliged to withdraw to Holland in order to escape the rage of ignorance; that Gassendi should have been often compelled to retire to Digne, far distant from the calumnies of Paris,—are events that load a nation with eternal opprobrium.

One of the philosophers who were most persecuted, was the immortal Bayle, the honour of human nature. I shall be told that the name of Jurieu, his slanderer and persecutor, is become execrable; I acknowledge that it is so; that of the jesuit le Tellier is become so likewise; but is it the less true that the great men whom he oppressed ended their days in exile and penury?

One of the pretexts made use of for reducing Bayle to poverty, was his article of David, in his valuable dictionary. He was reproached with not praising actions which were in themselves unjust, sanguinary, atrocious, contrary to good faith, or grossly offensive to decency.

Digitized by Google

Bayle certainly has not praised David for having, according to the Hebrew historian, collected six hundred vagabonds overwhelmed with debts and crimes; for having pillaged his countrymen at the head of these banditti; for having resolved to destroy Nabal and his whole family, because he refused paying contributions to him; for having hired out his services to king Achish the enemy of his country; for having afterwards betrayed Achish, notwithstanding his kindness to him; for having sacked the villages in alliance with that king; for having massacred in these villages every human being, including even infants at the breast, that no one might be found on a future day to give testimony of his depredations, as if an infant could have possibly disclosed his villainy; for having destroyed all the inhabitants of some other villages under saws, and harrows, and axes, and in brick-kilns; for having wrested the throne from Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, by an act of perfidy; for having despoiled of his property and afterwards put to death Mephibosheth, the grandson of Saul, and son of his own peculiar friend and generous protector Jonathan; or for having delivered up to the Gibeonites two other sons of Saul, and five of his grand-sons who perished by the gallows.

I do not notice the extreme incontinence of David, his numerous concubines, his adultery with Bathsheba, or his murder of Uriah.

What then! is it possible that the enemies of Bayle should have expected or wished him to eulogize all these cruelties and crimes? Ought he to have said—Go, ye princes of the earth, and imitate the man after God's own heart; massacre without pity the allies of your benefactor; destroy or deliver over to destruction the whole family of your king; appropriate to your own pleasures all the women, while you are pouring out the blood of the men; and you will thus exhibit models of human virtue, especially if, in addition to all the rest, you do but compose a book of psalms?

Was not Bayle perfectly correct in his observation,

Digitized by Google

that if David was the man after God's own heart, it must have been by his penitence, and not by his crimes? Did not Bayle perform a service to the human race when he said, that God, who undoubtedly dictated the Jewish history, has not consecrated all the crimes recorded in that history?

However, Bayle was in fact persecuted, and by whom? By the very men who had been elsewhere persecuted themselves; by refugees, who in their own country would have been delivered over to the flames; and these refugees were opposed by other refugees called jansenists, who had been driven from their own country by the jesuits; who have at length been themselves driven from it in their turn.

Thus all the persecutors declare against each other mortal war, while the philosopher, oppressed by them all, contents himself with pitying them.

It is not generally known, that Fontenelle, in 1718, was on the point of losing his pensions, place, and liberty, for having published in France, twenty years before, what may be called an Abridgment of the learned Van Dale's Treatise on Oracles, in which he had taken particular care to retrench and modify the original work, so as to give no unnecessary offence to fanaticism. A jesuit had written against Fontenelle, and he had not deigned to make him any reply; and that was enough to induce the jesuit Le Tellier, confessor to Louis XIV. to accuse Fontenelle to the king of atheism.

But for the fortunate mediation of M. d'Argenson, the son of a forging solicitor of Vire—a son worthy of such a father, as he was detected in forgery himself—would have proscribed, in his old age, the nephew of the great Corneille.

It is so easy for a confessor to seduce his penitent, that we ought to bless God that Le Tellier did no more harm than is justly imputed to him. There are two situations in which seduction and calumny cannot easily be resisted—the bed and the confessional.

We have always seen philosophers persecuted by fanatics. But can it be really possible, that men of

Digitized by Google

letters should be seen mixed up in a business so odious; and that they should often be observed sharpening the weapons against their brethren, by which they are themselves almost universally destroyed or wounded in their turn?

Unhappy men of letters, does it become you to turn informers? Did the Romans ever find a Garasse, a Chaumieux, or a Hayet, to accuse a Lucretius, a Possidonius, a Varro, or a Pliny?

How inexpressible is the meanness of being a hypocrite! how horrible is it to be a mischievous and malignant hypocrite! There were no hypocrites in ancient Rome, which reckoned us a small portion of its innumerable subjects. There were impostors, I admit, but not religious hypocrites, which are the most profligate and cruel species of all. Why is it that we see none such in England,* and whence does it arise that there still are such in France? Philosophers, you will solve this problem with ease.

SECTION II.

This brilliant and beautiful name has been sometimes honoured, and sometimes disgraced; like that of poet, mathematician, monk, priest, and everything dependent upon opinion.

Domitian banished the philosophers, and Lucian derided them. But what sort of philosophers and mathematicians were they whom the monster Domitian exiled? They were jugglers with their cups and balls; the calculators of horoscopes, fortune-tellers, miserable pedling Jews who composed philtres and talismans; gentry who had special and sovereign power over evil spirits, who evoked them from their infernal habitations, made them take possession of the bodies of men and women by certain words or signs, and dislodged them by other words or signs.

And what were the philososhers that Lucian held up to public ridicule? They were the dregs of the

* Certain pettifogging societies and canting combinations for the carrying on of partial prosecution, did not exist in England in the time of Voltaire.—T.

Digitized by Google

human race. They were a set of profligate beggars incapable of applying to any useful profession or occupation; men perfectly resembling the 'Poor Devil', who has been described to us with so much both of truth and humour; men who are undecided whether to wear a livery, or to write the almanack of the 'Annus Mirabilis,'* the marvellous year; whether to work on reviews, or on roads; whether to turn soldiers or priests; who in the mean time frequent the coffee-houses, to give their opinion upon the last new piece, upon God, upon being in general, and the various modes of being; who will then borrow your money, and immediately go away and write a libel against you in conjunction with the barrister Marchand,† or the creature called Chaudon, or the equally despicable wretch called Bonneval.

It was not from such a school that the Ciceros, the Atticuses, the Epictetuses, the Trajans, Adrians, Antonines, and Julians proceeded.

It was not such a school that formed a king of Prussia, who has composed as many philosophical treatises as he has gained battles, and who has levelled with the dust as many prejudices as enemies.

A victorious empress, at whose name the Ottomans tremble, and who so gloriously rules an empire more extensive than that of Rome, would never have been a great legislatrix, had she not been a philosopher. Every northern prince is so, and the north puts the south to absolute shame. If the confederates of Poland had only a very small share of philosophy, they would not expose their country, their estates, and their houses, to pillage; they would not drench their territory in blood; they would not obstinately and wantonly reduce themselves to being the most miserable of mankind; they would listen to the voice of their philosophic king, who has given so many noble proofs and so many admirable lessons of moderation and prudence in vain.

* The production of an Abbé d'Etrée of the village of Etrée.

† The barrister Marchand, author of the "Political Testament of an Academician," an abominable libel.

Digitized by Google

The great Julian was a philosopher when he wrote to his ministers and pontiffs his exquisite letters, abounding in clemency and wisdom, which all men of judgment and feeling highly admire, even at the present day, however sincerely they may condemn his errors.

Constantine was not a philosopher when he assassinated his relations, his son and his wife, and when, reeking with the blood of his family, he swore that God had sent to him the "Labarum" in the clouds.

It is a long bound that carries us from Constantine to Charles IX. and Henry III., kings of one of the fifty great provinces of the Roman empire. But if these kings had been philosophers, one would not have been guilty of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the other would not have made scandalous processions, nor have been reduced to the necessity of assassinating the duke of Guise and the cardinal his brother, and at length have been assassinated himself by a young jacobin, for the love of God and of the holy church.

If Louis the just, the thirteenth monarch of that name, had been a philosopher, he would not have permitted the virtuous de Thou and the innocent marshal de Marillac to have been dragged to the scaffold; he would not have suffered his mother to perish with hunger at Cologne; and his reign would not have been an uninterrupted succession of intestine discords and calamities.

Compare with those princes, thus ignorant, superstitious, cruel, and enslaved by their own passions or those of their ministers, such a man as Montaigne, or Charron, or the chancellor de l'Hospital, or the historian de Thou, or la Mothe Le Vayer, or a Locke, a Shaftesbury, a Sidney, or a Herbert; and say whether you would rather be governed by those sovereigns or by these sages.

When I speak of philosophers I do not mean the coarse and brutal cynics who appear desirous of being apes of Diogenes, but the men who imitate Plato and Cicero.

As for you, voluptuous courtiers, and you also, men of petty minds, invested with a petty employment

Digitized by Google

which confers on you a petty authority in a petty country, who uniformly exclaim against and abuse philosophy, proceed as long as you please with your invective railing. I consider you as the Nomentanuses inveighing against Horace; and the Cotins attempting to cry down Boileau.

SECTION III.

The stiff lutheran, the savage calvinist, the proud Anglican high churchman, the fanatical jansenist, the jesuit always aiming at dominion, even in exile and at the very gallows, the sorbonnist who deems himself one of the fathers of a council; these, and some imbecile beings under their respective guidance, inveigh incessantly and bitterly against philosophy. They are all different species of the canine race, snarting and howling in their peculiar ways against a beautiful horse that is pasturing in a verdant meadow, and who never enters into contest with them about any of the carrion carcases upon which they feed, and for which they are perpetually fighting with one another.

They every day produce from the press their trash of philosophic theology, their philosophico-theological dictionaries; their old and battered arguments, as common as the streets, which they denominate "demonstrations;" and their ten thousand times repeated and ridiculous assertions which they call "lemmas," and "corollaries;" as false coiners cover a lead crown with a plating of silver.

They perceive that they are despised by all persons of reflection, and that they can no longer deceive any but a few weak old women. This state is far more humiliating and mortifying than even being expelled from France and Spain and Naples. Everything can be supported except contempt. We are told, that when the devil was conquered by Raphael (as it is clearly proved he was) that haughty compound of body and spirit at first easily consoled himself with the idea of the chances of war. But when he understood that Raphael laughed at him, he roundly swore that he would never forgive him. Accordingly, the jesuits

Digitized by Google

never forgave Pascal; accordingly, Jurieu went on calumniating Bayle even to the grave; and just in the same manner all the Tartuffes, all the hypocrites, in Molière's time, inveighed against that author to his dying day.

In their rage they resort to calumnies, as in their folly they publish arguments.

One of the most determined slanderers, as well as one of the most contemptible reasoners that we have among us, is an ex-jesuit of the name of Paulian, who published a theologico-philosophical rhapsody in the city of Avignon, formerly a papal city, and perhaps destined to be so again.* This person accuses the authors of the Encyclopedia of having said,—

"That as man is by his nature open only to the pleasures of the senses, these pleasures are consequently the sole objects of his desires.

"That man in himself has neither vice nor virtue, neither good nor bad morals, neither justice nor injustice.

"That the pleasures of the senses produce all the virtues.

"That in order to be happy, men must extinguish remorse, &c."

In what articles of the Encyclopedia, of which five new editions have lately commenced, are these horrible positions to be found? You are bound actually to produce them. Have you carried the insolence of your pride and the madness of your character to such an extent, as to imagine that you will be believed on your bare word? These ridiculous absurdities may be found perhaps in the works of your own casuists, or those of the Porter of the Chartreux, but they are certainly not to be found in the articles of the Encyclopedia composed by M. Diderot, M. d'Alembert, the chevalier Jaucourt, or M. de Voltaire. You have never seen them in the articles of the count de Tressan, nor in those of Messrs. Blondel, Boucher-d'Argis, Marmontel, Venel, Tronchin, d'Aubenton, d'Argen-

* This article was printed when the king of France was in possession of the city of Avignon—See the article AVIGNON.

Digitized by Google

ville, and various others, who generously devoted their time and labours to enrich the Encyclopedic Dictionary, and thereby conferred an everlasting benefit on Europe. Most assuredly, not one of them is chargable with the abominations you impute to them. Only yourself, and Abraham Chaumieux the vinegar merchant and crucified convulsionary, could be capable of broaching so infamous a calumny.

You confound error with truth, because you have not sense sufficient to distinguish between them. You wish to stigmatise as impious the maxim adopted by all publicists, "That every man is free to choose his country."

What! you contemptible preacher of slavery, was not queen Christina free to travel to France and reside at Rome? Were not Casimir and Stanislaus authorised to end their days in France? Was it necessary, because they were Poles, that they should die in Poland? Did Goldoni, Vanloo, and Cassini give offence to God by settling at Paris? Have all the Irish, who have established themselves in fame and fortune in France, committed by so doing a mortal sin?

And you have the stupidity to print such extravagance and absurdity as this, and Riballier has stupidity enough to approve and sanction you; and you range in one and the same class Bayle, Montesquieu, and the madman de La Metrie; and it may be added, you have found the French nation too humane and indulgent, notwithstanding all your slander and malignity, to deliver you over to anything but scorn!

What! do you dare to calumniate your country (if indeed a jesuit can be said to have a country)? Do you dare to assert, "that philosophers alone in France attribute to chance the union and disunion of the atoms which constitute the soul of man?" "Mentiris impudentissime!" I defy you to produce a single book, published within the last thirty years, in which anything at all is attributed to chance, which is merely a word without a meaning.

Do you dare to accuse the sagacious and judicious

Digitized by Google

Locke of having said, "that it is possible the soul may be a spirit, but that he is not perfectly sure it is so; and that we are unable to decide what it may be able or unable to acquire?"

"Mentiris impudentissime!" Locke, the truly respectable and venerable Locke, says expressly, in his answer to the cavilling and sophistical Stillingfleet, "I am strongly persuaded, that although it cannot be shown (by mere reason) that the soul is immaterial, because the veracity of God is a demonstration of the truth of all that he has revealed, and the absence of another demonstration can never throw any doubt upon what is already demonstrated."

See moreover, under the article SOUL, how Locke expresses himself on the bounds of human knowledge, and the immensity of the power of the Supreme Being.

The great philosopher Bolingbroke declares, that the opinion opposite to Locke's is blasphemy.

All the fathers, during the three first ages of the church, regarded the soul as a light attenuated species of matter, but did not the less, in consequence, regard it as immortal. But now, forsooth, even your college drudges consequentially put themselves forward, and denounce as "atheists" those who, with the fathers of the christian church, think that God is able to bestow and to preserve the immortality of the soul, whatever may be the substance it consists of.

You carry your audacity so far as to discover atheism in the following words, "Who produces motion in nature? God. Who produces vegetation in plants? God. Who produces motion in animals? God. Who produces thought in man? God."

We cannot so properly say on this occasion, "mentiris impudentissime;" but we should rather say, you impudently blaspheme the truth.

We conclude with observing, that the hero of the ex-jesuit Paulian is the ex-jesuit Patouillet, the author of a bishop's mandate in which all the parliaments of the kingdom are insulted. This mandate was burnt by the hands of the executioner. Nothing after this was wanting but for the ex-jesuit Paulian to elevate the ex-jesuit

Digitized by Google

Nonotte to be a father of the church, and to canonise the jesuits Malagrida, Guignard, Garnet, and Oldham, and all other jesuits to whom God has granted the grace of being hanged or quartered: they were all of them great metaphysicians, great philosophico-theologians.

SECTION IV.

People who never think, frequently enquire of those who do think, what has been the use of philosophy? To destroy in England the religious rage which brought Charles I. to the scaffold; to deprive an archbishop in Sweden of the power, with a papal bull in his hand, of shedding the blood of the nobility; to preserve in Germany religious peace, by holding up theological disputes to ridicule; finally, to extinguish in Spain the hideous and devouring flames of the inquisition.

Gauls! unfortunate Gauls! it prevents stormy and factious times from producing among you a second "Fronde," and a second "Damiens."

Priests of Rome! it compels you to suppress your bull "In cœna domini," that monument of impudence and stupidity.

Nations! it humanizes your manners. Kings, it gives you instruction!

SECTION V.

The philosopher is the lover of wisdom and truth; to be a sage, is to avoid the senseless and the depraved. The philosopher therefore should live only among philosophers.

I will suppose that there are still some sages among the Jews: if one of these, when dining in company with some rabbis, should help himself to a plate of eels or hare, or if he cannot refrain from a hearty laugh at some superstitious and ridiculous observations made by them in the course of conversation, he is for ever ruined in the synagogue: the like remark may be made of a Mussulman, a Gueber, or a Banian.

I know it is contended by many, that the sage should never develop his opinions to the vulgar; that he

Digitized by Google

should be a madman with the mad, and foolish among fools: no one however has yet ventured to say, that he should be a knave among knaves. But if it be required that a sage should always join in opinion with the deluders of mankind, is not this clearly the same as requiring that he should not be an honest man? Would any one require that a respectable physician should always be of the same opinion as charlatans?

The sage is a physician of souls. He ought to bestow his remedies on those who ask them of him, and avoid the company of quacks, who will infallibly persecute him. If therefore a madman of Asia Minor, or a madman of India, says to the sage, My good friend, I think you do not believe in the mare Borac, or in the metamorphoses of Vishnoo: I will denounce you, I will hinder you from being bostangi, I will destroy your credit, I will persecute you; the sage ought to pity him and be silent.

If ignorant persons, but at the same time persons of good understanding and dispositions, and willing to receive instruction, should ask him, Are we bound to believe that the distance between the moon and Venus is only five hundred leagues, and that between Mercury and the sun the same, as the principal fathers of the Mussulman religion insist, in opposition to all the most learned astronomers?—the sage may reply to them, that the fathers may possibly be mistaken. He should at all times inculcate upon them, that an hundred abstract dogmas are not of the value of a single good action, and that it is better to relieve one individual in distress, than to be profoundly acquainted with the abolishing and abolished.....

When a rustic sees a serpent ready to dart at him, he will kill it; when a sage perceives a bigot and a fanatic, what will he do? he will prevent them from biting.

PHILOSOPHY.

Write filosophy or philosophy as you please, but agree that as soon as it appears it is persecuted. Dogs to whom you present an aliment for which they have no taste, bite you.

Digitized by Google

You will say that I repeat myself; but we must an hundred times remind mankind, that the holy conclave condemned Galileo, and that the pedants who declared all the good citizens excommunicated who should submit to the great Henry IV. were the same who condemned the only truths which could be found in the works of Descartes.

All the spaniels of the theological kennel bark at one another, and all together at De Thou, La Mothe, Le Vayer, and Bayle. What nonsense has been written by little Celtic scholars against the wise Locke!

These Celts say that Cæsar, Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, and Marcus Aurelius, might be philosophers, but that philosophy is not permitted among the Celts. We answer, that it is permitted and very useful among the French; that nothing has done more good to the English; and that it is time to exterminate barbarity.

You reply, that that will never come to pass. No; with the uninformed and foolish it will not; but with honest people the affair is soon concluded.

SECTION II.

One of the great misfortunes, as also one of the great follies, of mankind, is, that in all countries which we call polished, except perhaps China, priests concern themselves with what belongs only to philosophers. These priests interfered with regulating the year; it was, they say, their right; for it was necessary that the people should know their holydays. Thus the Chaldean, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman priests believed themselves mathematicians and astronomers;—but what mathematics and astronomy! Whoever makes a trade of quackery cannot have a just and enlightened mind. They were astrologers, and never astronomers.*

The Greek priests themselves first made the year to consist only of three hundred and sixty days. Their geometricians must have informed them that they were deceived by five days and more. They therefore cor-

* See the article ASTROLOGY.

Digitized by Google

rected their year. Other geometricians further showed them that they were deceived by six hours. Iphitus obliged them to change their Greek almanack. They added one day in four years to their faulty year; Iphitus celebrated this change by the institution of the Olympiads.

They were finally obliged to have recourse to the philosopher Meton, who, combining the year of the moon with that of the sun, composed his cycle of nineteen years, at the end of which the sun and moon returned to the same point within an hour and a half. This cycle was graven in gold in the public place of Athens; and it is of this famous golden number that we still make use, with the necessary corrections.

We well know what ridiculous confusion the Roman priests introduced in their computation of the year.

Their blunders were so great, that their summer holidays arrived in winter. Cæsar, the universal Cæsar, was obliged to bring the philosopher Sosigenes from Alexandria, to repair the enormous errors of the pontiffs.

When it was necessary to correct the calendar of Julius Cæsar, under the pontificate of Gregory XIII. to whom did they address themselves? Was it to some inquisitor? It was to a philosopher and physician named Lilio.

When the almanack was given to Professor Cogé, rector of the university, to compose, he knew not even the subject. They were obliged to apply to M. de Lalande, of the academy of sciences, who was burthened with this very painful task, too poorly recompensed.

The rhetorician Cogé therefore made a great mistake, when he proposed for the prize of the university this subject so strangely expressed:—

"Non magis Deo quàm regibus infensa est ista quæ vocatur hodiè philosophia."—That which we now call philosophy is not more the enemy of God than of kings.

He would say *less* the enemy. He has taken *magis*

Digitized by Google

for *minus*. And the poor man ought to know that our academies are not enemies either to the king or God.*

SECTION III.

If philosophy has done so much honour to France in the Encyclopedia, it must also be confessed that the ignorance and envy which have dared to condemn this work would have covered France with opprobrium, if twelve or fifteen convulsionaries, who formed a cabal, could be regarded as the organs of France: they were really only the ministers of fanaticism and sedition; those who forced the king to dissolve the body which they had seduced. Their fanatical credulity for convulsions and the miserable impostures of St. Medard was so strong, that they obliged a magistrate, elsewhere wise and respectable, to say in full parliament, that the miracles of the catholic church always existed. By these miracles, we can only understand those of convulsions, for assuredly, it never performed any others; at least, if we believe not in the little children resuscitated by St. Ovid. The time of miracles is passed; the triumphant church has no longer occasion for them. Seriously: was there one of the persecutors of the Encyclopedia who understood a word of the articles Astronomy, Dynamics, Geometry, Metaphysics, Botany, Medicine, or Anatomy, of which this book, become so necessary, treats in every volume?† What a crowd of absurd imputations and gross calumnies have they accumulated against this treasure of all the sciences! They should be reprinted at the end of the Encyclopedia, to eternise their shame. See what it is to judge

* See the discourse of the advocate Belleguir on this subject; it is curious enough.—Vol. I. of the Philosophy.

† We well know, that all is not equal in this immense work, and that it is not possible for it to be so. The articles of Cahuac and other similar intruders cannot equal those of Diderot, D'Alembert, Jaucourt, Boucher, D'Argis, Venel, Du Marsais, and so many other true philosophers; but altogether the work is an eternal service rendered to mankind, as a proof of which it is reprinting everywhere. The same honour is not paid to its detractors. That they have existed, is only known by the mention which we make of them.

Digitized by Google

a work which they were not even fit to study. The fools! they have exclaimed that philosophy ruined catholicism. What then, in twenty millions of people, has one been found who has vexed the least officer of the parish! one who has failed in respect to the churches! one who has publicly proffered against our ceremonies a single word which approached the virulence with which these railers have expressed themselves against the regal authority!

Let us repeat, that philosophy never did evil to the state, and that fanaticism, joined to the *esprit du corps*, has done much in all times.

SECTION IV.

Substance of Ancient Philosophy.

I have consumed about forty years of my pilgrimage in two or three corners of the world, seeking the philosopher's stone called truth. I have consulted all the adepts of antiquity, Epicurus and Augustin, Plato and Malebranche, and I still remain in ignorance. In all the crucibles of philosophers, there are perhaps two or three ounces of gold, but all the rest is *caput mortuum*, insipid mire, from which nothing can be extracted.

It seems to me that the Greeks, our masters, wrote much more to show their intellect, than they made use of their intellect to instruct themselves. I see not a single author of antiquity who has a consistent, methodical, clear system, going from consequence to consequence.

All that I have been able to obtain by comparing and combining the systems of Plato, of the tutor of Alexander, Pythagoras, and the Orientals, is this:—

Chance is a word void of sense; nothing can exist without a cause. The world is arranged according to mathematical laws; therefore it is arranged by an intelligence.

It is not an intelligent being like myself who presided at the formation of the world; for I cannot form a miserable worm; therefore the world is the work of an intelligence prodigiously superior.

Digitized by Google

Does this being, who possesses intelligence and power in so high a degree, necessarily exist? It must be so; for he must either have received being from another, or through his own nature. If he has received his being from another, which is very difficult to conceive, I must look up to this other, which will in that case be the first cause. On whichever side I turn, I must admit a first cause, powerful and intelligent, who by his own nature is necessarily so.

Has this first cause created things out of nothing? We cannot conceive that to create out of nothing is to change nothing into something. I cannot admit such a creation, at least until I find invincible reasons which force me to admit what my mind can never comprehend.

All that exists appears to exist necessarily, since it exists; for if to-day there is a reason for the existence of things, there was one yesterday; there has been one in all times; and this cause must always have had its effect, without which it would have been an useless cause during eternity.

But how can things have always existed, being visibly under the hand of the first cause? This power must always have acted in like manner. There is no sun without light, there is no motion without a being passing from one point of space to another.

There is therefore a powerful and intelligent being who has always acted; and if this being had not acted, of what use to him would have been his existence? All things are therefore emanations from this first cause.

But how can we imagine that stone and clay may be emanations of the eternal, intelligent, and puissant being?

Of two things one must be: either that the matter of this stone and mine necessarily exists of itself, or that it exists necessarily by this first cause: there is no medium.

Thus, therefore, there are but two parts to take: either to admit matter eternal of itself, or matter eternally proceeding from a powerful, intelligent, eternal being.

Digitized by Google

But existing of its own nature, or emanating from a producing being, it exists from all eternity, because it exists; and there is no reason that it might not have always existed.

If matter is eternally necessary, it is in consequence impossible—it is contradictory, that it should not exist; but what man can assure us that it is impossible, that it is contradictory, that this fly and this flint have not always existed? We are however obliged to swallow this difficulty, which more astonishes the imagination than contradicts the principles of reasoning.

Indeed, as soon as we have conceived that all has emanated from the supreme and intelligent being; that nothing has emanated from him without reason; that this being, always existing, must always have acted; that consequently all things must have eternally proceeded from the bosom of his existence,—we should no more be deterred from believing the matter of which this fly and flint are formed is eternal, than we are deterred from conceiving light to be an emanation of the all-powerful being.

Since I am an extended and thinking being, my extent and thought are the necessary productions of this being. It is evident to me that I cannot give myself extent or thought. I have therefore received both from this necessary being.

Can he have given me what he has not? I have intelligence; I am in space; therefore he is intelligent and is in space.

To say that the eternal being, the all-powerful God, has from all time necessarily filled the universe with his productions, is not taking from him his free-will; but on the contrary, for free-will is but the power of acting. God has always fully acted; therefore God has always used the plenitude of his liberty.

The liberty which we call indifference is a word without an idea—an absurdity; for this would be to determine without reason; it would be an effect without a cause. Therefore God cannot have this pretended free-will, which is a contradiction in terms. He has therefore always acted by the same necessity which

Digitized by Google

causes his existence. It is therefore impossible for the world to exist without God; it is impossible for God to exist without the world.

This world is filled with beings who succeed each other; therefore God has always produced beings in succession.

These preliminary assertions are the basis of the ancient eastern philosophy and of that of the Greeks. We must except Democritus and Epicurus, whose corpuscular philosophy has combatted these dogmas. But let us remark, that the Epicureans were founded on an entirely erroneous philosophy, and that the metaphysical system of all the other philosophy subsisted with all the physical systems. All nature, except the void, contradicts Epicurus, and no phenomenon contradicts the philosophy which I explain. Now a philosophy which agrees with all which passes in nature, and which contents the most attentive minds, is it not superior to all other unrevealed systems?

After the assertions of the most ancient philosophers, which I have approached as nearly as possible, what remains to us? A chaos of doubts and chimeras. I believe that there never was a philosopher of a system, who did not confess at the end of his life that he had lost his time. It must be confessed, that the inventors of the mechanical arts have been much more useful to men than the inventors of syllogisms. He who imagined a ship, towers much above him who imagined innate ideas.

PHYSICIANS.

Regimen is superior to medicine, especially as, from time immemorial, out of every hundred physicians, ninety-eight are charlatans. Molière was right in laughing at them; for nothing is more ridiculous than to witness an infinite number of silly women, and men no less women, when they have eaten, drunk, sported, or abstained from repose too much, call in a physician for the head-ache, invoke him like a god, and request him to work the miracle of producing an alliance be-

Digitized by Google

tween health and intemperance, not omitting to fee the said god, who laughs at their folly.

It is not however the less true, that an able physician may preserve life on an hundred occasions,* and restore to us the use of our limbs. When a man falls into an apoplexy, it is neither a captain of infantry nor a serjeant at law who will cure him. If cataracts are formed on my eyes, it is not my neighbour who will relieve me. I distinguish not between physicians and surgeons, these professions being so intimately connected.

Men who are occupied in the restoration of health to other men, by the joint exertion of skill and humanity, are above all the great of the earth. They even partake of divinity, since to preserve and renew is almost as noble as to create.

The Roman people had no physicians for more than five hundred years. This people, whose sole occupation was slaughter, in particular cultivated not the art of prolonging life. What therefore happened at Rome to those who had a putrid fever, a fistula, a gangrene, or an inflammation of the stomach? They died. The small number of great physicians introduced into Rome were only slaves. A physician among the great Roman patricians was a species of luxury, like a cook. Every rich man had his perfumers, his bathers, his harpers, and his physician. The celebrated Musa, the physician of Augustus, was a slave; he was freed and made a Roman knight; after which physicians became persons of consideration.

When christianity was so fully established as to bestow on us the felicity of possessing monks, they

* This is not because our days are not numbered. It is certain that everything is the result of an invincible necessity, without which all would proceed by chance—an absolute absurdity. No man can augment either the number of his days, or his hairs; no physician, or even angel, can add one minute to the minutes which the eternal order of things has irrevocably destined to us; but he who is destined to be stricken at a certain moment with an apoplexy may be destined also to meet with an able physician who bleeds him, and does whatever is necessary to save his life. Destiny gives us equally the disease and the remedy—the fever and the bark.—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

were expressly forbidden, by many councils, from practising medicine. They should have prescribed a precisely contrary line of conduct, if it were desirable to render them useful to mankind.

How beneficial to society, were monks obliged to study medicine and to cure our ailments for God's sake! Having nothing to gain but heaven, they would never be charlatans; they would equally instruct themselves in our diseases and their remedies, one of the finest of occupations, and the only one forbidden them. It has been objected, that they would poison the impious; but even that would be advantageous to the church. Had this been the case, Luther would never have stolen one half of catholic Europe from our holy father the pope; for in the first fever which might have seized the augustin Luther, a dominican would have prepared his pills. You will tell me that he would not have taken them; but with a little address this might have been managed. But to proceed:—

Towards the year 1517 lived a citizen, animated with a christian zeal, named John; I do not mean John Calvin, but John, surnamed of God, who instituted the brothers of charity. This body, instituted for the redemption of captives, is composed of the only useful monks, although not accounted among the orders. The dominicans, bernardines, norbertins, and benedictines, acknowledge not the brothers of charity. They are simply adverted to in the continuation of the Ecclesiastical History of Fleuri. Why? Because they have performed cures instead of miracles—have been useful and not caballed—cured poor women without either directing or seducing them. Lastly, their institution being charitable, it is proper that other monks should despise them.

Medicine having then become a mercenary profession in the world, as the administration of justice is in many places, it has become liable to strange abuses. But nothing is more estimable than a physician who, having studied nature from his youth, knows the pro-

Digitized by Google

perties of the human body, the diseases which assail it, the remedies which will benefit it, exercises his art with caution, and pays equal attention to the rich and the poor. Such a man is very superior to the general of the capuchins, however respectable this general may be.

PIRATES, OR BUCCANEERS.

In the time of cardinal Richelieu, when the Spaniards and French detested each other, because Ferdinand the catholic laughed at Louis XII., and Francis I. was taken at the battle of Pavia by an army of Charles V.—whilst this hatred was so strong, that the false author of the political romance, and political piece of tediousness, called the Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu, feared not to call the Spaniards "an insatiable nation, who rendered the Indies tributaries of hell;"—when in short we were leagued in 1635 with Holland against Spain; when France had nothing in America, and the Spaniards covered the seas with their galleys,—then buccaneers began to appear. They were at first French adventurers, whose quality was at most that of corsairs.

One of them, named Legrand, a native of Dieppe, associated himself with fifty determined men, and went to tempt fortune in a bark which had not even a cannon. Towards the isle of Hispaniola (St. Domingo) he perceived a galley strayed from the great Spanish fleet; he approached it as a captain wishing to sell provisions; he mounted, attended by his people; he entered the chamber of the captain who was playing at cards, threw him down, made him prisoner with his cargo, and returned to Dieppe with his vessel laden with immense riches. This adventure was the signal for forty years unheard-of exploits.

French, English, and Dutch buccaneers associated together in the caverns of St. Domingo, of the little islands of St. Christopher and Tortola. They chose a chief for each expedition, which was the first origin of

Digitized by Google

kings. Agriculturists would never have wished for a king; they had no need of one to sow, thrash, and sell corn.

When the buccaneers took a great prize, they bought with it a little vessel and cannon. One happy chance produced twenty others. If they were an hundred in number, they were believed to be a thousand; it was difficult to escape them, still more so to follow them. They were birds of prey who established themselves on all sides, and who retired into inaccessible places: sometimes they ravaged from four to five hundred leagues of coast; sometimes they advanced on foot, or horseback, two hundred leagues up the countries.

They surprised and pillaged the rich towns of Chagra, Maracaybo, Vera-Cruz, Panama, Portorico, Campeachy, the island of St. Catherine, and the suburbs of Carthagena.

One of these pirates, named Olonois,* penetrated to the gates of Havanna, followed by twenty men only. Having afterwards retired into his boat, the governor sent against him a ship of war with soldiers and an executioner. Olonois rendered himself master of the vessel, cut off the heads of the Spanish soldiers, whom he had taken himself, and sent back the executioner to the governor. Such astonishing actions were never performed by the Romans, or by other robbers. The warlike voyage of Admiral Anson round the world is only an agreeable promenade, in comparison with the passage of the buccaneers in the South Sea, and with what they endured on terra firma.

Had their policy been equal to their invincible courage, they would have founded a great empire in America. They wanted females; but instead of ravishing and marrying Sabines, like the Romans, they procured them from the brothels of Paris, which sufficed not to produce a second generation.

They were more cruel towards the Spaniards than the Israelites ever were to the Canaanites. A Dutchman is spoken of, named Roc, who put several Spaniards

* This Olonois was afterwards taken, and eaten by savages.

Digitized by Google

on a spit and caused them to be eaten by his comrades. Their expeditions were tours of thieves, and never campaigns of conquerors; thus, in all the West Indies, they were never called anything but 'los ladrones.' When they surprised and entered the house of a father of a family, they put him to the torture to discover his treasures. That sufficiently proves what we say in the article QUESTION, that torture was invented by robbers.

What rendered their exploits useless was, that they lavished in debauches, as foolish as monstrous, all that they acquired by rapine and murder. Finally, there remains nothing more of them than their name, and scarcely that. Such were the buccaneers.

But what people in Europe have not been pirates? The Goths, Alains, Vandals, and Huns, were they anything else? What were Rollo, who established himself in Normandy, and William Fier-a-bras, but the most able pirates? Was not Clovis a pirate, who came from the borders of the Rhine into Gaul?

PLAGIARISM.

IT is said that this word is derived from the Latin word 'plaga,' and that it signifies the condemnation to the scourge of those who sold freemen for slaves. This has nothing in common with the plagiarism of authors, who sell not men either enslaved or free. They only for a little money occasionally sell themselves.

When an author sells the thoughts of another man for his own, the larceny is called plagiarism. All the makers of dictionaries, all compilers who do nothing else than repeat backwards and forwards the opinions, the errors, the impostures, and the truths already printed, we may term plagiarists; but honest plagiarists, who arrogate not the merit of invention. They pretend not even to have collected from the ancients the materials which they get together; they only copy the laborious compilers of the sixteenth century. They will sell you in quarto that which already exists in folio: Call them if you please bookmakers, not au-

Digitized by Google

thors; range them rather among second-hand dealers than plagiarists.

The true plagiarist is he who gives the works of another for his own, who inserts in his rhapsodies long passages from a good book a little modified. The enlightened reader, seeing this patch of cloth of gold upon a blanket, soon detects the bungling purloiner.

Ramsay, who after having been a presbyterian in his native Scotland, an anglican in London, then a quaker, and who finally persuaded Fénélon that he was a catholic, and even pretended a penchant for celestial love—Ramsay, I say, compiled the Travels of Cyrus, because his master made his Telemachus travel. So far he only imitated; but in these travels he copies from an old English author, who introduces a young solitary dissecting his dead goat, and arriving at a knowledge of the deity by the process, which is very much like plagiarism. On conducting Cyrus into Egypt, in describing that singular country, he employs the same expressions as Bossuet, whom he copies word for word without citing: this is plagiarism complete. One of my friends reproached him with this one day; Ramsay replied, that he was not aware of it, and that it was not surprising he should think like Fénélon and write like Bossuet. This was making out the adage, "Proud as a Scotsman."

The most singular of all plagiarism is possibly that of Father Barre, author of a large history of Germany in ten volumes. The history of Charles XII. had just been printed, and he inserted more than two hundred pages of it in his work; making a duke of Lorraine say precisely that which was said by Charles XII.

He attributes to the emperor Arnold that which happened to the Swedish monarch.

He relates of the emperor Rodolph that which was said of king Stanislaus.

Waldemar, king of Denmark, acts precisely like Charles at Bender, &c. &c.

The most pleasant part of the story is, that a journalist, perceiving this extraordinary resemblance be-

Digitized by Google

tween the two works, failed not to impute the plagiarism to the author of the history of Charles XII., who had composed his work twenty years before the appearance of that of Father Barre.

It is chiefly in poetry that plagiarism is allowed to pass; and certainly of all larcenies it is that which is least dangerous to society.

PLATO.

SECTION I.

Of the Timeus of Plato and some other Things.

The fathers of the church, of the first four centuries, were all Greeks and Platonists: you find not one Roman who wrote for christianity, or who had the slightest tincture of philosophy. I will here observe, by the way, that it is strange enough, the great church of Rome, which contributed in nothing to this establishment, has alone reaped all the advantage. It has been with this revolution, as with all those produced by civil wars: the first who trouble a state, always unknowingly labour for others rather than for themselves.

The school of Alexandria, founded by one named Mark, to whom succeeded Athenagorus, Clement, and Origen, was the centre of the christian philosophy. Plato was regarded by all the Greeks of Alexandria as the master of wisdom, the interpreter of the divinity. If the first christians had not embraced the dogmas of Plato, they would never have had any philosophers, any man of mind in their party. I set aside inspiration and grace, which are above all philosophy, and speak only of the ordinary course of human events.

It is said, that it was principally in the Timeus of Plato that the Greek fathers were instructed. This Timeus passes for the most sublime work of all ancient philosophy. It is almost the only one which Dacier has not translated, and I think the reason is, because he did not understand it, and that he feared to discover to clear sighted readers the face of this

Digitized by Google

Greek divinity, who is only adored because he is veiled.

Plato, in this fine dialogue, commences by introducing an Egyptian priest, who teaches Solon the ancient history of the city of Athens, which was preserved faithfully for nine thousand years in the archives of Egypt.

Athens, says the priest, was once the finest city of Greece, and the most renowned in the world for the arts of war and peace: she alone resisted the warriors of the famous island Atlantides, who came in innumerable vessels to subjugate a great part of Europe and Asia. Athens had the glory of freeing so many vanquished people, and of preserving Egypt from the servitude which menaced us. But after this illustrious victory and service rendered to mankind, a frightful earthquake in twenty-four hours swallowed the territory of Athens, and all the great island of Atlantides. This island is now only a vast sea, which the ruins of this ancient world and the slime mixed with its waters render unnavigable.

This is what the priest relates to Solon; and such is the manner in which Plato prepares to explain to us subsequently, the formation of the soul, the operations of the word, and his trinity. It is not physically impossible, that there might be an island Atlantides, which has not existed for nine thousand years, and which perished by an earthquake, like Herculaneum and so many other cities; but our priest, in adding that the sea which washes Mount Atlas is inaccessible to vessels, renders the history a little suspicious.

It may be after all, that since Solon—that is to say, in the course of three thousand years—vessels have dispersed the slime of the ancient island Atlantides and rendered the sea navigable; but it is still surprising, that he should prepare by this island to speak of the "Word."

Perhaps in telling this priest's or old woman's story, Plato wished to insinuate something contrary to the vicissitudes which have so often changed the face of the globe. Perhaps he would merely say, what Pythagorus and Timeus of Locris have said so long before hi-

Digitized by Google

and what our eyes tell us every day—that everything in nature perishes and is renewed. The history of Deucalion and Pyrrha, the fall of Phaeton, are fables; but inundations and conflagrations are truths.

Plato departs from his imaginary island, to speak of things which the best of philosophers of our days would not disavow. "That which is produced has necessarily a cause, an author. It is difficult to discover the author of this world; and when he is found, it is dangerous to speak of him to the people."

Nothing is more true, even now, than that if a sage, in passing by our Lady of Loretto, said to another sage, his friend, that our Lady of Loretto, with her little black face, governs not the entire universe, and a good woman overheard these words, and related them to other good women of the March of Ancona, the sage would be stoned like Orpheus. This is precisely the situation in which the first christians were believed to be, who spoke not well of Cybele and Diana, which alone should attach them to Plato. The unintelligible things which he afterwards treats of, ought not to disgust us with him.

I will not reproach Plato with saying, in his Timeus, 'that the world is an animal;' for he no doubt understands, that the elements in motion animate the world; and he means not, by animal, a dog or a man, who walks, feels, eats, sleeps, and engenders. An author should always be explained in the most favourable sense; and it is not whilst we accuse people, or when we denounce their books, that it is right to interpret malignantly and poison all their words; nor is it thus that I shall treat Plato.

According to him, there is a kind of trinity which is the soul of matter. These are his words: "From the indivisible substance, always similar to itself, and the divisible substance, a third substance is composed, which partakes of the same and of others."

Afterwards came the Pythagorean number, which renders the thing still more unintelligible, and consequently more respectable. What ammunition for people commencing a paper war!

Digitized by Google

Friend reader, a little patience and attention, if you please: "When God had formed the soul of the world of these three substances, the soul shot itself into the midst of the universe, to the extremities of being; spreading itself everywhere, and re-acting upon itself, it formed at all times a divine origin of eternal wisdom."

And some lines afterwards: "Thus the nature of the immense animal which we call the *world*, is eternal."

Plato, following the example of his predecessors, then introduces the Supreme Being, the creator of the world, forming this world before time; so that God could not exist without the world, nor the world without God; as the sun cannot exist without shedding light into space, nor this light steal into space without the sun.

I pass in silence many Greek, or rather Oriental ideas; as for example—that there are four sorts of animals—celestial gods, birds of the air, fishes, and terrestrial animals, to which last we have the honour to belong.

I hasten to arrive at a second trinity: "the being engendered, the being who engenders, and the being which resembles the engendered and the engenderer." This trinity is formal enough, and the fathers have found their account in it.

This trinity is followed by a rather singular theory of the four elements. The earth is founded on a equilateral triangle, water on a right angled triangle, air on a scalene; and fire on an isoceles triangle. After which he demonstratively proves, that there can be but five worlds, because there are but five regular solid bodies, and yet that there is but one world which is round.

I confess, that no philosopher in Bedlam has ever reasoned so powerfully. Rouse yourself, friend reader, to hear me speak of the other famous trinity of Plato, which his commentators have so much vaunted: it is the Eternal Being, the Eternal Creator of the world; his word, intelligence, or idea; and the good which results from it. I assure you that I have sought for it diligently in this Timeus, and I have never

Digitized by Google

found it there; it may be there 'totidem litteris,' but it is not 'totidem verbis,' or I am much mistaken.

After reading all Plato with great reluctance, I perceived some shadow of the trinity for which he is so much honoured. It is in the sixth book of his Chimerical Republic, in which he says—"Let us speak of the son, the wonderful production of good, and his perfect image." But unfortunately he discovers this perfect image of God to be the sun. It was therefore the physical sun, which with the word and the father composed the platonic trinity.

In the Epinomis of Plato there are very curious absurdities, one of which I translate as reasonably as I can, for the convenience of the reader.

"Know that there are eight virtues in heaven: I have observed them, which is easy to all the world. The sun is one of its virtues, the moon another; the third is the assemblage of stars; and the five planets, with these three virtues, make the number eight. Be careful of thinking that these virtues, or those which they contain, and which animate them, either move of themselves or are carried in vehicles; be careful, I say, of believing, that some may be gods and others not; that some may be adorable, and others such as we should neither adore or invoke. They are all brothers; each has his share; we owe them all the same honours; they fill all the situations which the *word* assigned to them, when it formed the visible universe."

Here is the *word* already found: we must now find the three persons. They are in the second letter from Plato to Dionysius, which letters assuredly are not forged; the style is the same as that of his dialogues. He often says to Dionysius and Dion things very difficult to comprehend, and which we might believe to be written in numbers; but he also tells us very clear ones, which have been found true a long time after him. For example, he expresses himself thus in his seventh letter to Dion:—

"I have been convinced that all states are very badly governed; there is scarcely any good institution.

Digitized by Google

or administration. We see as it were, day after day, that all follows the path of fortune rather than that of wisdom."

After this short digression on temporal affairs, let us return to spiritual ones, to the trinity. Plato says to Dionysius:—

"The king of the universe is surrounded by his works: all is the effect of his grace. The finest of things have their first cause in him; the second in perfection have in him their second cause, and he is further the third cause of works of the third degree."

The trinity, such as we acknowledge, could not be recognised in this letter; but it was a great point to have in a Greek author a guarantee of the dogmas of the dawning church. Every Greek church was therefore platonic, as every Latin church was peripatetic, from the commencement of the third century. Thus two Greeks whom, we have never understood, were the masters of our opinions until the time in which men at the end of two thousand years were obliged to think for themselves.

SECTION II.

Questions on Plato and on some other Trifles.

Plato in saying to the Greeks what so many philosophers of other nations have said before him, in assuring them that there is a supreme intelligence which arranged the universe, did he think that this supreme intelligence resided in a single place, like a king of the east in his seraglio? Or rather did he believe that this powerful intelligence spread itself everywhere like light, or a being still more delicate, prompt, active, and penetrating than light? The god of Plato, in a word, is he in matter, or is he separated from it? Oh you who have read Plato attentively, that is to say seven or eight fantastical dreams hidden in some garret in Europe, if ever these questions reach you; I implore you to answer them.

The barbarous island of Cassiterides, in which men lived in the woods in the time of Plato, has finally produced philosophers who are as much beyond him as

Digitized by Google

Plato was beyond those of his contemporaries who reasoned not at all.

Among these philosophers, Clarke is perhaps altogether the clearest, the most profound, the most methodical and the strongest of all those who have spoken of the Supreme Being.

When he gave his excellent book to the public he found a young gentleman of the county of Gloucester who candidly advanced objections as strong as his demonstrations. We can see them at the end of the first volume of Clarke; it was not on the necessary existence of the Supreme Being that he reasoned; it was on his infinity and immensity.

It appears not indeed, that Clarke has proved that there is a being who penetrates intimately all which exists, and that this being whose properties we cannot conceive has the property of extending himself to the greatest imaginable distance.

The great Newton has demonstrated that there is a void in nature; but what philosopher could demonstrate to me that God is in this void; that he touches it; that he fills it? How, bounded as we are, can we attain to the knowledge of these mysteries? Does it not suffice, that it proves to us that a supreme master exists? It is not given to us to know what he is nor how he is.

It seems as if Locke and Clarke had the keys of the intelligible world. Locke has opened all the apartments which can be entered; but has not Clarke wished to penetrate a little above the edifice?

How could a philosopher like Samuel Clarke, after so admirable a work on the existence of God, write so pitiable a one on matters of fact?

How could Benedict Spinosa, who had as much profundity of mind as Samuel Clarke, after raising himself to the most sublime metaphysics, how could he not perceive that a supreme intelligence presides over works visibly arranged with a supreme intelligence—if it is true after all that such is the system of Spinosa?

How could Newton, the greatest of men, comment upon the Apocalypse, as we have already remarked?

Digitized by Google

How could Locke, after having so well developed the human understanding, degrade his own in another work?

I fancy I see eagles, who after darting into a cloud go to rest on a dunghill.

POETS.

A YOUNG man on leaving college deliberates whether he shall be an advocate, a physican, a theologian, or a poet—whether he shall take care of our body, our soul, or our entertainment. We have already spoken of advocates and physicians; we will now speak of the prodigious fortune which is sometimes made by the theologian.

The theologian becomes pope, and has not only his theological valets, cooks, singers, chamberlains, physicians, surgeons, sweepers, agnus dei makers, confectioners, and preachers, but also his poet. I know not what inspired personage was the poet of Leo X., as David was for some time the poet of Saul.

It is surely of all the employments in a great house that which is the most useless. The kings of England, who have preserved in their island many of the ancient usages which are lost on the continent, have their official poet.* He is obliged once a year to make an ode in praise of St. Cecilia,† who played so marvellously on the organ or psalterion, that an angel descended from the ninth heaven to listen to her more conveniently—the harmony of the psaltery, in ascending from this place to the land of angels, necessarily losing a small portion of its volume.

Moses is the first poet that we know of; but it is thought that before him the Chaldeans, the Syrians, and the Indians practised poetry, since they possessed music. Nevertheless, the fine canticle which Moses

* And have still; those too who officially manufacture the most surprising hexameters.—T.

† The odes of Dryden and Pope doubtless misled Voltaire into this supposition. How much more stupendous the misconception, if some future foreign writer should assert, that on the death of every monarch it was the province of his laureate to write a Vision of Judgment!—T.

Digitized by Google

chaunted with his sister Miriam, when they came out of the red sea, is the most ancient poetical monument in hexameter verse that we possess. I am not of the opinion of those impious and ignorant rogues, Newton, Le Clerc, and others, who prove that all this was written about eight hundred years after the event, and who insolently maintain that Moses could not write in Hebrew, since Hebrew is only a comparatively modern dialect of the Phenician, of which Moses could know nothing at all. I examine not with the learned Huet how Moses was able to sing so well, who stammered and could not speak.

If we listened to many of these authors, Moses would be less ancient than Orpheus, Musæus, Homer, and Hesiod. We perceive at the first glance the absurdity of this opinion; as if a Greek could be as ancient as a Jew.

Neither will I reply to those impertinent persons who suspect that Moses is only an imaginary personage, a fabulous imitation of the fable of the ancient Bacchus; and that all the prodigies of Bacchus, since attributed to Moses, were sung in orgies before it was known that Jews existed in the world. This idea refutes itself: it is obvious to good sense that it is impossible Bacchus could exist before Moses.

We have still however an excellent Jewish poet undeniably anterior to Horace—king David; and we know well how infinitely superior the 'Miserere' is to the 'Justum ac tenacem propositi virum.'

But what is most astonishing, legislators and kings have been our earliest poets. We find even at present people so good as to become poets for kings. Virgil indeed had not the office of poet to Augustus, nor Lucan that of poet to Nero; but I confess that it would have debased the profession not a little to make gods of either the one or the other.

It is asked, why poetry, being so unnecessary to the world, occupies so high a rank among the fine arts? The same question may be put with regard to music. Poetry is the music of the soul, and above all of great and of feeling souls.

Digitized by Google

One merit of poetry few persons will deny; it says more and in fewer words than prose.

Who was ever able to translate the following Latin verses with the brevity with which they came from the brain of the poet?

Vive memor lethi, fugit hora, hoc quod loquor indè est.

I speak not of the other charms of poetry, as they are well known; but I insist upon the grand precept of Horace, 'Sapere est principium et fons.' There can be no great poetry without great wisdom; but how connect this wisdom with enthusiasm? Like Cæsar, who formed his plan of battle with circumspection, and fought with all possible ardour.

There have no doubt been ignorant poets, but then they have been bad poets. A man acquainted only with dactyls and spondees, and with a head full of rhymes, is rarely a man of sense; but Virgil is endowed with superior reason.

Lucretius, in common with all the ancients, was miserably ignorant of physical laws, a knowledge of which is not to be acquired by wit. It is a knowledge which is only to be attained by instruments, which in his time had not been invented. Glasses are necessary—microscopes, pneumatic machines, barometers, &c. to have even a distant idea of the operations of nature.

Descartes knew little more than Lucretius, when his keys opened the sanctuary; and an hundred times more of the path has been trodden from the time of Galileo, who was better instructed physically than Descartes, to the present day, than from the first Hermes to Lucretius.

All ancient physics are absurd: it was not thus with the philosophy of mind, and that good sense which, assisted by strength of intellect, can acutely balance between doubts and appearances. This is the chief merit of Lucretius; his third book is a masterpiece of reasoning. He argues like Cicero, and expresses himself like Virgil; and it must be confessed, that when our illustrious Polignac attacked his third book, he refuted it only like a cardinal.

When I say, that Lucretius reasons in his third book

Digitized by Google

like an able metaphysician, I do not say that he was right. We may argue very soundly, and deceive ourselves, if not instructed by revelation. Lucretius was not a Jew, and we know that Jews alone were in the right in the days of Cicero, of Possidonius, of Cæsar, and of Cato. Lastly, under Tiberius, the Jews were no longer in the right, and common sense was possessed by the christians exclusively.

Thus it was impossible that Lucretius, Cicero and Cæsar could be anything but imbecile, in comparison with the Jews and ourselves; but it must be allowed, that in the eyes of the rest of the world they were very great men.

I allow that Lucretius killed himself, as well as Cato, Cassius, and Brutus; but they might very well kill themselves, and still reason like men of intellect during their lives.

In every author let us distinguish the man from his works. Racine wrote like Virgil, but he became jansenist through weakness, and he died in consequence of weakness equally great—because a man in passing through a gallery did not bestow a look upon him.* I am very sorry for all this; but the part of Phedra is not therefore the less admirable.

POISONINGS.

Let us often repeat useful truths. There have always been fewer poisonings than have been spoken of: it is almost with them as with parricides; the accusations have been very common, and the crimes very rare. One proof is, that we have a long time taken for poison that which is not so. How many princes have got rid of those who were suspected by them by making them drink bullock's blood! How many other princes have swallowed it themselves to avoid falling into the

* Louis XIV. took some offence at Racine, and passed him in an anti-chamber without the usual notice. The consequence is well known; Racine, like a genuine Frenchman, sickened and died. This weakness, filtered through a modern Scottish novel, might be transformed into the purest of the virtues; at least such has been the mode of treating very similar virtue.—T.

Digitized by Google

ands of their enemies! All ancient historians, and even Plutarch, attest it.

I was so infatuated with these tales in my childhood, that I bled one of my bulls, in the idea that his blood belonged to me, since he was born in my stable (an ancient pretension of which I will not here dispute the validity). I drank this blood, like Atreus and Mademoiselle de Vergi, and it did me no more harm than horse's blood does to the Tartars, or pudding does to us every day, if it be not too rich.

Why should the blood of a bull be a poison, when that of a goat is considered a remedy? The peasants of my province swallow the blood of a cow, which they call fricassée, every day; that of a bull is not more dangerous. Be sure, dear reader, that Themistocles died not of it.

Some speculators of the court of Louis XIV. believed they discovered that his sister-in-law, Henrietta of England, was poisoned with powder of diamonds, which was put into a bowl of strawberries, instead of grated sugar; but neither the impalpable powder of glass or diamonds, nor that of any production of nature which was not in itself venomous, could be hurtful.

They are only sharp-cutting active points which can become violent. The exact observer Mead, a celebrated English physician, saw through a microscope the liquor shot from the gums of irritated vipers. He pretends that he has always found them strewn with these cutting pointed blades, the immense number of which tear and pierce the internal membranes.*

---

* We cannot explain the effects of a poison by a mechanical cause of this kind. Some appear to have a chemical action on our organs, which they destroy by decomposing the substance which forms them. Such are caustic poisons. The venom of the viper appears only to have a purely organic action. (See the work of M. l'Abbé Fontana on the venom of the viper.) We pretend not to pronounce that the mechanical action of bodies, their chemical and organic action, may be one of a different nature; but facts prove that these three species of actions exist, and nothing proves to us that they should be reduced to a single one, nor even gives us a glimpse of the possibility of it.—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

The cantarella, of which it is pretended that pope Alexander VI. and his bastard the duke of Borgia made great use, was, it is said, the foam of a hog rendered furious by suspending him by the feet with his head downwards, in which situation he was beat to death; it was a poison as prompt and violent as that of the viper. A great apothecary assures me, that la Tofana, that celebrated poisoness of Naples, principally made use of this receipt; all which is perhaps untrue.* This science is one of those of which we should be ignorant.

Poisons which coagulate the blood, instead of tearing the membranes, are opium, hemlock, henbane, aconite, and several others. The Athenians became so refined as to cause their countrymen, condemned to death, to die by poisons reputed cold; an apothecary was the executioner of the republic. It is said, that Socrates died very peacefully, and as if he slept: I can scarcely believe it.

I make one remark on the Jewish books, which is, that among this people we see no one who was poisoned. A crowd of kings and priests perished by assassination; the history of the nation is the history of murders and robberies: but a single instance only is mentioned of a man who was poisoned, and this man was not a Jew—he was a Syrian named Lysias, general of the armies of Antiochus Epiphanus. The second book of Maccabees says,† that he poisoned himself—'veneno vitam finivit;' but these books of Maccabees are very suspicious. My dear reader, I have already desired you to believe nothing lightly.

---

* It is very probable that it is a popular story. It would be more easy not to think of penetrating these pretended secrets; but those who know anything on these subjects should have the prudence to be silent. It is not that these truths might not be useful, if they were known like any other species of truth, but they should only be published in works which show at the same times the danger, the precautions which can preserve us from it, and the remedies.—*French Ed.*

The Aqua Tofana is now well known, and certainly has nothing in common with the slaver of an enraged pig. Morphine, and similar chemical concentrations are at present the rage.—T.

† Chap. x. 13.

Digitized by Google

What astonishes me most in the history of the manners of the ancient Romans is, the conspiracy of the Roman women to cause to perish by poison, not only their husbands, but the principal citizens in general. It was, says Titus Livius, in the year 423 from the foundation of Rome, and therefore in the time of the most austere virtue; it was before we heard speak of any divorce, though divorce was authorised; it was when women drank no wine, and scarcely ever went out of their houses, except to the temples. How can we imagine, that they suddenly applied themselves to the knowledge of poisons; that they assembled to compose them; and, without any apparent interest, thus administered death to the first men in Rome?

Lawrence Echard, in his abridged compilation, contents himself with saying, that "the virtue of the Roman ladies was strangely belied; that one hundred and seventy who meddled with the art of making poisons, and of reducing this art into precepts, were all at once accused, convicted, and punished." Titus Livius assuredly does not say, that they reduced this art into rules. That would signify, that they held a school of poisons, that they professed it as a science; which is ridiculous. He says nothing about an hundred and seventy professors in corrosive sublimate and verdigris. Finally, he does not affirm that there were poisoners among the wives of the senators and knights.

The people were extremely foolish, and reasoned at Rome as elsewhere. These are the words of Titus Livius:—

"The year 423 was of the number of unfortunate ones: there was a mortality caused by the temperature of the air or by human malice. I wish that we could affirm with some author, that the corruption of the air caused this epidemic, rather than attribute the death of so many Romans to poison, as many historians have falsely written, to decry this year."*

They have therefore written falsely, according to

* First decade, book viii.

Digitized by Google

Titus Livius, who believes not that the ladies of Rome were poisoners: but what interest had authors in decrying this year? I know not.

"I relate the fact," continues he, "as it was related before me." This is not the speech of a satisfied man; besides, the alleged fact much resembles a fable. A slave accuses about seventy women, among whom are several of the patrician rank, of causing the plague in Rome by preparing poisons. Some of the accused demand permission to swallow their drugs and expire on the spot; and their accomplices are condemned to death without the manner of their punishment being specified.

I suspect that this story to which Titus Livius gives no credit, deserves to be banished to the place in which the vessel is preserved which a vestal drew to shore with her girdle; where Jupiter in person stopped the flight of the Romans; where Castor and Pollux came to combat on horse-back in their behalf; where a flint was cut with a razor; and where Simon Barjonas, surnamed Peter, disputed miracles with Simon the magician.

There is scarcely any poison of which we cannot prevent the consequences by combatting it immediately. There is no medicine which is not a poison when taken in too strong a dose.

All indigestion is a poison.

An ignorant physician, and even a learned but inattentive one, is often a poisoner. A good cook is a certain slow poisoner, if you are not temperate.

One day the marquis d'Argenson, minister of state for the foreign department, whilst his brother was minister of war, received from London a letter from a fool (as ministers do by every post); this fool proposed an infallible means of poisoning all the inhabitants of the capital of England. This does not regard me, said the marquis d'Argenson to us; it is a packet to my brother.

Digitized by Google

POLICY.

The policy of man consists, at first, in endeavouring to arrive at a state equal to that of animals, whom nature has furnished with food, cloathing, and shelter.

To attain this state is a matter of no little time and difficulty.

How to procure for himself subsistence and accommodation, and protect himself from evil, comprises the whole object and business of man.

This evil exists everywhere; the four elements of nature conspire to form it. The barrenness of one quarter part of the world, the numberless diseases to which we are subject, the multitude of strong and hostile animals by which we are surrounded, oblige us to be constantly on the alert in body and in mind, to guard against the various forms of evil.

No man, by his own individual care and exertion, can secure himself from evil; he requires assistance. Society therefore is as ancient as the world.

This society consists sometimes of too many, and sometimes of too few. The revolutions of the globe have often destroyed whole races of men and other animals, in many countries, and have multiplied them in others.

To enable a species to multiply, a tolerable climate and soil are necessary; and even with these advantages, men may be under the necessity of going unclothed, of suffering hunger, of being destitute of everything, and of perishing in misery.

Men are not like beavers, or bees, or silk-worms; they have no sure and infallible instinct which procures for them necessaries.

Among an hundred men, there is scarcely one that possesses genius; and among women, scarcely one among five hundred.

It is only by means of genius that those arts are invented, which eventually furnish something of that accommodation which is the great object of all policy.

To attempt these arts with success, the assistance

Digitized by Google

of others is requisite; hands to aid you, and minds sufficiently acute and unprejudiced to comprehend you, and sufficiently docile to obey you. Before however all this can be discovered and brought together, thousands of years roll on in ignorance and barbarism; thousands of efforts for improvement terminate only in abortion. At length, the outlines of an art are formed, but thousands of ages are still requisite to carry it to perfection.

Foreign Policy.

When any one nation has become acquainted with metallurgy, it will certainly beat its neighbours and make slaves of them. You possess arrows and sabres, and were born in a climate that has rendered you robust. We are weak, and have only clubs and stones. You kill us, or if you permit us to live, it is that we may till your fields and build your houses. We sing some rustic ditty to dissipate your spleen or animate your languor, if we have any voice; or we blow on some pipes, in order to obtain from you clothing and bread. If our wives and daughters are handsome, you appropriate them without scruple to yourselves. The young gentleman, your son, not only takes advantage of the established policy, but adds new discoveries to this growing art. His servants proceed, by his orders, to emasculate my unfortunate boys, whom he then honours with the guardianship of his wives and mistresses. Such has been policy, the great art of making mankind contribute to individual advantage and enjoyment; and such is still policy throughout the largest portion of Asia.

Some nations, or rather hordes, having thus by superior strength and skill brought into subjection others, begin afterwards to fight with one another for the division of the spoil. Each petty nation maintains and pays soldiers. To encourage, and at the same time to control these soldiers, each possesses its gods, its oracles, and prophecies; each maintains and pays its soothsayers and slaughtering priests. These soothsayers or augurs begin with prophecying in favour of

Digitized by Google

the heads of the nation; they afterwards prophecy for themselves, and obtain a share in the government. The most powerful and shrewd prevail at last over the others, after ages of carnage which excite our horror, and of impostures which excite our laughter. Such is the regular course and completion of policy.

While these scenes of ravage and fraud are carried on in one portion of the globe, other nations, or rather clans, retire to mountain caverns, or districts surrounded by inaccessible swamps, marshes, or some verdant and solitary spot in the midst of vast deserts of burning sand; or some peninsular and consequently easily protected territory, to secure themselves against the tyrants of the continent. At length, all become armed with nearly the same description of weapons; and blood flows from one extremity of the world to the other.

Men however cannot for ever go on killing one another; and peace is consequently made, till either party thinks itself sufficiently strong to recommence the war. Those who can write draw up these treaties of peace; and the chiefs of every nation, with a view more successfully to impose upon their enemies, invoke the gods to attest with what sincerity they bind themselves to the observance of these compacts. Oaths of the most solemn character are invented and employed, and one party engages in the name of the great Somonocodom, and the other in that of Jupiter the avenger, to live for ever in peace and amity; while in the same names of Samonocodom and Jupiter, they take the first opportunity of cutting one another's throats.

In times of the greatest civilization and refinement, the lion of Æsop made a treaty with three animals, who were his neighbours. The object was to divide the common spoil into four equal parts. The lion, for certain incontestable and satisfactory reasons which he did not then deem it necessary to detail, but which he should be always ready to give in due time and place, first takes three parts out of the four for himself, and then threatens instant strangulation to whoever shall

Digitized by Google

dare to touch the fourth. This is the true sublime of policy.

Internal Policy.

The object here is to accumulate for our own country the greatest quantity of power, honour, and enjoyment possible. To attain these in any extraordinary degree, much money is indispensable.

In a democracy it is very difficult to accomplish this object. Every citizen is your rival; a democracy can never subsist but in a small territory. You may have wealth almost equal to your wishes through your own mercantile dealings, or transmitted in patrimony from your industrious and opulent grandfather; your fortune will excite jealousy and envy, but will purchase little real co-operation and service. If an affluent family ever bears sway in a democracy, it is not for a long time.

In an aristocracy, honours, pleasures, power, and money, are more easily attainable. Great discretion however is necessary. If abuse is flagrant, revolution will be the consequence.

Thus in a democracy all the citizens are equal. This species of government is at present rare, and appears to but little advantage,* although it is in itself natural and wise.

In aristocracy, inequality or superiority makes itself sensibly felt; but the less arrogant its demeanour, the more secure and successful will be its course.

Monarchy remains to be mentioned. In this, all mankind are made for one individual: he accumulates all honours with which he chooses to decorate himself, tastes all pleasures to which he feels an inclination, and exercises a power absolutely without control; provided, let it be remembered, that he has plenty of money. If he is deficient in that, he will be unsuccessful at home as well as abroad, and will soon

* Had Voltaire lived to witness the establishment of the United States of America, he would have corrected this passage. Despotism would be very happy to preserve the present reading.—T.

Digitized by Google

be left destitute of power, pleasures, honours, and perhaps even of life.

While this personage has money, not only is he successful and happy himself, but his relations and principal servants are flourishing in full enjoyment also; and an immense multitude of hirelings labour for them the whole year round, in the vain hope that they shall themselves, some time or other, enjoy in their cottages the leisure and comfort which their sultan and bashaws enjoy in their harems. Observe however what will probably happen.

A jolly full-fed farmer was formerly in possession of a vast estate, consisting of fields, meadows, vineyards, orchards, and forests. An hundred labourers worked for him, while he dined with his family, drank his wine, and went to sleep. His principal domestics, who plundered him, dined next, and eat up nearly everything. Then came the labourers, for whom there was left only a very meagre and insufficient meal. They at first murmured, then openly complained, speedily lost all patience, and at last ate up the dinner prepared for their master, and turned him out of his house. The master said they were a set of scoundrels, a pack of undutiful and rebellious children who assaulted and abused their own father. The labourers replied, that they had only obeyed the sacred law of nature, which he had violated. The dispute was finally referred to a soothsayer in the neighbourhood, who was thought to be actually inspired. The holy man takes the farm into his own hands, and nearly famishes both the labourers and the master; till at length their feelings counteract their superstition, and the saint is in the end expelled in his turn. This is domestic policy.

There have been more examples than one of this description; and some consequences of this species of policy still subsist in all their strength. We may hope that in the course of ten or twelve thousand ages, when mankind become more enlightened, the great proprietors of estates, grown also more wise, will on the

Digitized by Google

one hand treat their labourers rather better, and on the other take care not to be duped by soothsayers.

POLYPUS.

In quality of a doubter, I have a long time filled my vocation. I have doubted when they would persuade me, that the *glossopetres* which I have seen formed in my fields were originally the tongues of sea-dogs, that the lime used in my barn was composed of shells only, that corals were the production of the excrement of certain little fishes, that the sea by its currents has formed Mount Cenis and Mount Taurus, and that Niobe was formerly changed into marble.

It is not that I love not the extraordinary, the marvellous, as well as any traveller or man of system; but to believe firmly, I would see with my own eyes, touch with my own hands, and that several times. Even that is not enough; I would still be aided by the eyes and hands of others.

Two of my companions, who, like myself, form questions on the Encyclopedia, have for some time amused themselves with me in studying the nature of several of the little films which grow in ditches by the side of water lentils. These light herbs, which we call polypi of soft water, have several roots, from which circumstance we have given them the name of polypi. These little parasite plants were merely plants, until the commencement of the age in which we live. Leuenhoeck raises them to the rank of animals. We know not if they have gained much by it.

We think that, to be considered as an animal, it is necessary to be endowed with sensation. They therefore commence by shewing us, that these soft-water polypi have feeling, in order that we should present them with our right of citizenship.

We have not dared to grant it the dignity of sensation, though it appeared to have the greatest pretensions to it. Why should we give it to a species of small rush? Is it because it appears to bud? This property is common to all trees growing by the water-

Digitized by Google

side; to willows, poplars, aspins, &c. It is so light, that it changes place at the least motion of the drop of water which bears it; thence it has been concluded that it walked. In like manner, we may suppose that the little, floating, marshy islands of St. Omer are animals, for they often change their place.

It is said its roots are feet, its stalk its body, its branches are its arms; the pipe which composes the stalk is pierced at the top,—it is its mouth. In this pipe there is a light white pith, of which some almost imperceptible animalcules are very greedy; they enter the hollow of this little pipe by making it bend, and eat this light paste;—it is the polypus who captures these animals with his snout, though it has not the least appearance of head, mouth, or stomach.

We have examined this sport of nature with all the attention of which we are capable. It appeared to us that the production called polypus resembled an animal much less than a carrot or asparagus. In vain we have opposed to our eyes all the reasonings which we formerly read; the evidence of our eyes has overthrown them.

It is a pity to lose an illusion. We know how pleasant it would be to have an animal which could produce itself by offshoots, and which, having all the appearances of a plant, could join the animal to the vegetable kingdom.

It would be much more natural to give the rank of an animal to the newly-discovered plant of Anglo-America, to which the pleasant name of Venus' Fly-trap has been given. It is a kind of prickly sensitive plant, the leaves of which fold of themselves; the flies are taken in these leaves and perish there more certainly than in the web of a spider. If any of our physicians would call this plant an animal, he would have partisans.

But if you would have something more extraordinary, more worthy of the observation of philosophers, observe the snail, which lives one and two whole months after its head is cut off, and which afterwards has a second head, containing all the organs possessed by the first.

Digitized by Google

This truth, to which all children can be witnesses, is more worthy than the illusion of polypi of soft-water. What becomes of its sensorium, its magazine of ideas, and soul, when its head is cut off? How do all these return? A soul which is renewed is a very curious phenomenon; not that it is more strange than a soul begotten, a soul which sleeps and awakes, or a condemned soul.*

POLYTHEISM.

The plurality of Gods is the great reproach at present cast upon the Greeks and Romans: but let any man show me, if he can, a single fact in the whole of their histories, or a single word in the whole of their books, from which it may be fairly inferred that they believed in many supreme gods; and if neither that fact nor word can be found; if, on the contrary, all antiquity is full of monuments and records which attest one sovereign god, superior to all other gods, let us candidly admit, that we have judged the ancients as harshly as we too often judge our contemporaries.

We read in numberless passages that Zeus, Jupiter, is the master of gods and men. "Jovis omnia plena;" all things are full of Jupiter. And St. Paul gives this testimony in favour of the ancients: "In ipso vivimus, movemur, et sumus, ut quidam vestrorum poetarum dixit." "In God we live, and move, and have our being, as one of your own poets has said." After such an acknowledgment as this, how can we dare to accuse

* Phœdrus has said, *Periculosum est credere et non credere.* M. de Voltaire here carries the doubt too far. It is difficult not to regard the polypus as an animal, after reading with attention the fine experiments of M. Tremblai. As to the rest, M. de Voltaire denies not the facts, but merely that polypi are animals; and he believes that their stronger analogy with plants should banish them to the vegetable dominions. This should be observed by those who have reproached him with this opinion with so much warmth, and who have themselves need of indulgence for opinions much less excusable. (See chap. iii. of Singularities of Nature, vol. of Physic).—*Fr. Ed.*

Digitized by Google

our instructors of not having recognised a supreme God?

We have no occasion whatever to examine upon this subject, whether there was formerly a Jupiter who was king of Crete, and who may possibly have been considered and ranked as a god; or whether the Egyptians had twelve superior gods, or eight, among whom the deity called Jupiter by the Latins might be one. The single point to be investigated and ascertained here is, whether the Greeks and Romans acknowledged one celestial being as the master or sovereign of other celestial beings. They constantly tell us that they do; and we ought therefore to believe them.

The admirable letter of the philosopher Maximus of Madaura to St. Augustin is completely to our purpose: "There is a God," says he, "without any beginning, the common father of all, but who never produced a being like himself. What man is so stupid and besotted as to doubt it?" Such is the testimony of a pagan of the fourth century on behalf of all antiquity.

Were I inclined to lift the veil that conceals the mysteries of Egypt, I should find the deity adored under the name of Knef, who produced all things and presides over all the other deities; I should discover also a Mithra among the Persians, and a Brama among the Indians, and could perhaps show, that every civilized nation admitted one supreme being, together with a multitude of dependent divinities. I do not speak of the Chinese, whose government, more respectable than all the rest, has acknowledged one only God for a period of more than four thousand years. Let us here confine ourselves to the Greeks and Romans, who are the object of our immediate researches. They had among them innumerable superstitions—it is impossible to doubt it: they adopted fables absolutely ridiculous—every body knows it; and I may safely add, that they were themselves sufficiently disposed to ridicule them. After all, however, the foundation of their theology was conformable to reason.

In the first place, with respect to the Greeks placing

Digitized by Google

heroes in heaven as a reward for their virtues, it was one of the most wise and useful of religious institutions. What nobler recompense could possibly be bestowed upon them? What more animating and inspiring hope could be held out to them? Is it becoming that we above all others should censure such a practice—we who, enlightened by the truth, have piously consecrated the very usage which the ancients imagined? We have a far greater number of the blessed in honour of whom we have created altars, than the Greeks and Romans had of heroes and demi-gods; the difference is, that they granted the apotheosis to the most illustrious and resplendent actions, and we grant it to the most meek and retired virtues. But their deified heroes never shared the throne of Jupiter, the great architect, the eternal sovereign of the universe; they were admitted to his court and enjoyed his favours. What is there unreasonable in this? Is it not a faint shadow and resemblance of the celestial hierarchy presented to us by our own religion? Nothing can be of more salutary moral tendency than such an idea; and the reality is not physically impossible in itself. We have surely upon this subject no fair ground for ridiculing nations to whom we are indebted even for our alphabet.

The second object of our reproaches, is the multitude of gods admitted to the government of the world; Neptune presiding over the sea, Juno over the air, Æolus over the winds, and Pluto or Vesta over the earth, and Mars over armies. We set aside the genealogies of all these divinities, which are as false as those which are every day fabricated and printed respecting individuals among ourselves; we pass sentence of condemnation on all their light and loose adventures, worthy of being recorded in the pages of the Thousand and One Nights, and which never constituted the foundation or essence of the Greek and Roman faith; but let us at the same time candidly ask, where is the folly and stupidity of having adopted beings of a secondary order, who, whatever they may be in relation to the great supreme, have at least some power over our very differently-con-

Digitized by Google

stituted race, which, instead of belonging to the second, belongs perhaps to the hundred thousandth order of existences? Does this doctrine necessarily imply either bad metaphysics or bad natural philosophy? Have we not ourselves nine choirs of celestial spirits, more ancient than mankind? Has not each of these choirs a peculiar name? Did not the Jews take the greater number of these names from the Persians? Have not many angels their peculiar functions assigned them? There was an exterminating angel, who fought for the Jews, and the angel of travellers, who conducted Tobit. Michael was the particular angel of the Hebrews; and, according to Daniel, he fights against the angel of the Persians, and speaks to the angel of the Greeks. An angel of inferior rank gives an account to Michael, in the book of Zachariah, of the state in which he had found the country. Every nation possessed its angel; the version of the Seventy says, in Deuteronomy, that the lord allotted the nations according to the number of angels. St. Paul, in the Acts of the Apostles, talks to the angel of Macedonia. These celestial spirits are frequently called gods in scripture, 'Eloim.' For among all nations the word that corresponds with that of 'Theos,' 'Deus,' 'Dieu,' 'God,' by no means universally signifies the Sovereign Lord of heaven and earth; it frequently signifies a celestial being, a being superior to man, but dependent upon the great Sovereign of Nature; and it is sometimes bestowed even on princes and judges.

Since then to us it is a matter of truth and reality, that celestial substances actually exist, who are entrusted with the care of men and empires, the people who have admitted this truth without the light of revelation, are more worthy of our esteem than our contempt.

The ridicule therefore does not attach to polytheism itself, but to the abuse of it; to the popular fables of superstition; to the multitude of absurd divinities which have been supposed to exist, and to the number of which every individual might add at his pleasure.

Digitized by Google

The goddess of nipples, 'dea Rumilia;' the goddess of conjugal union, 'dea Pertunda;' the god of the water-closet, 'deus Stercutius;' the god of flatulence, 'deus Crepitus,' are certainly not calculated to attract the highest degree of veneration. These ridiculous absurdities, the amusement of the old women and children of Rome, merely prove that the word 'deus' had acceptations of a widely different nature. Nothing can be more certain or obvious, than that the god of flatulence 'deus Crepitus,' could never excite the same idea as 'deus divûm et hominum sator,' the source of gods and men. The Roman pontiffs did not admit the little burlesque and baboon-looking deities which silly women introduced into their cabinets. The Roman religion was in fact, in its intrinsic character, both serious and austere. Oaths were inviolable; war could not be commenced before the college of heralds had declared it just; and a vestal convicted of having violated her vow of virginity, was condemned to death. These circumstances announce a people inclined to austerities, rather than a people volatile, frivolous, and addicted to ridicule.

I confine myself here to showing, that the senate did not reason absurdly in adopting polytheism. It is asked, how that senate, to two or three deputies from which we were indebted both for chains and laws, could permit so many extravagances among the people, and authorise so many fables among the pontiffs? It would be by no means difficult to answer this question. The wise have in every age made use of fools. They freely leave to the people their lupercals and their saturnalia, if they only continue loyal and obedient; and the sacred pullets that promised victory to the armies, are judiciously secured against the sacrilege of being slaughtered for the table. Let us never be surprised at seeing, that the most enlightened governments have permitted customs and fables of the most senseless character. These customs and fables existed before government was formed; and no one would pull down an immense city, however irregular in its buildings, to erect it precisely according to line and level.

Digitized by Google

How can it arise, we are asked, that on one side we see so much philosophy and science, and on the other so much fanaticism? The reason is, that science and philosophy were scarcely born before the time of Cicero, and that fanaticism reigned for centuries. Policy, in such circumstances, says to philosophy and fanaticism, Let us all three live together as well as we can.

POPERY.

THE PAPIST.

His highness has within his principality Lutherans, Calvinists, Quakers, Anabaptists, and even Jews; and you wish that he would admit Unitarians?

THE TREASURER.

Certainly, if these Unitarians bring with them wealth and industry. You will only be the better paid your wages.

PAPIST.

I must confess, that a diminution of my wages would be more disagreeable to me than the admission of these persons; but then they do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

TREASURER.

What does that signify to you, provided that you are permitted to believe it, and are well lodged, well clothed, and well fed? The Jews are far from believing that he is the Son of God, and yet you are very easy with the Jews, with whom you deposit your money at six per cent. St. Paul himself has never spoken of the divinity of Jesus Christ, who is undisguisedly called a man. "Death," says he, "entered into the world by the sin of one man . . . and by one man, Jesus Christ, the gift of grace hath abounded unto many,"* &c. All the early fathers of the church thought like Paul. It is evident that for three hundred years Jesus was content with his humanity; imagine yourself a christian of one of the first three centuries.

* Romans, v. 12, 13.

Digitized by Google

PAPIST.

Yes, sir; but neither do they believe in eternal punishments.

TREASURER.

Nor I either; be you damned eternally, if you please; for my own part, I do not look for that advantage.

PAPIST.

Ah, sir; it is very hard not to be able to damn at pleasure all the heretics in the world; but the rage which the Unitarian displays for rendering everybody finally happy is not my only complaint. Know, that these monsters believe the resurrection of the body no more than the Sadducees. They say, that we are all anthropophagi, and that the particles which compose our grandfathers and great grandfathers, having been necessarily dispersed in the atmosphere, become carrots and asparagus, and that it is possible we may have devoured a portion of our ancestors.

TREASURER.

Be it so; our children will do as much by us; it is but repayment, and papists will be as much benefited as others. This is no reason for driving you from the states of his highness; and why any more so for ejecting the Unitarians? Rise again, if you are able; it matters little whether the Unitarians rise again or no, provided they are useful during their lives.

PAPIST.

And what, sir, do you say to original sin, which they boldly deny? Are you not scandalised by their assertion, that the Pentateuch says not a word about it, that the bishop of Hippo, St. Augustin, is the first who decidedly taught this dogma, although it is evidently indicated by St. Paul?

TREASURER.

Truly, if the Pentateuch does not mention it, that is not my fault. Why not add a text or two about original sin to the Old Testament, as it is said you have added many on other subjects? I know nothing of these subtleties; it is my business only to pay you your stipend, when I have the money to do so.

Digitized by Google

POPULATION.

SECTION I.

THERE were very few caterpillars in my canton last year, and we killed nearly the whole of them. God has rendered them this year more numerous than the leaves.

Is it not nearly thus with other animals, and above all with mankind? Famine, pestilence, death, and the two sister diseases which have visited us from Arabia and America, destroy the inhabitants of a province, and we are surprised at finding it abound with people an hundred years afterwards.

I admit that it is a sacred duty to people this world, and that all animals are stimulated by pleasure to fulfil this intention of the great Demi-urgos.

Why this inhabiting of the earth? and to what purpose form so many beings to devour one another, and the animal man to cut the throat of his fellow, from one end of the earth to the other? I am assured that I shall one day be in the possession of this secret, and in my character of an inquisitive man I exceedingly desire it.

It is clear that we ought to people the earth as much as we are able; even our health renders it necessary.

The wise Arabians, the robbers of the desert, in the treaties which they made with travellers, always stipulated for girls. When they conquered Spain, they imposed a tribute of girls. The country of Media pays the Turks in girls. The buccaneers brought girls from Paris to the little island of which they took possession; and it is related that at the fine spectacle with which Romulus entertained the Sabines, he stole from them three hundred girls.

I cannot conceive why the Jews, whom moreover I revere, killed everybody in Jericho, even to the girls; and why they say in the Psalms, that it will be sweet to massacre the infants at the mother's breast, without excepting even girls.

Digitized by Google

All other people, whether Tartars, Cannibals, Teutons, or Celts, have always held girls in great request.

Owing to this happy instinct, it seems that the earth may one day be covered with animals of our own kind. Father Petau makes the inhabitants of the earth seven hundred millions, two hundred and eighty years after the deluge. It is not however at the end of the Arabian Nights that he has printed this pleasant enumeration.

I reckon at present upon our globe about nine hundred millions of contemporaries, and an equal number of each sex. Wallace makes them a thousand millions. Am I in error, or is he? Possibly both of us; but a tenth is a small matter; the arithmetic of historians is usually much more erroneous.

I am somewhat surprised that the arithmetician Wallace, who extends the number of people at present existing to a thousand millions, should pretend in the same page, that in the year 966, after the creation, our forefathers amounted to 1610 millions.

In the first place, I wish the epoch of the creation to be clearly established; and as, in our western world, we have no less than eighty theories of this event, there will be some difficulty to hit on the correct one.

In the second place, the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Indians, and the Chinese, have all different calculations; and it is still more difficult to agree with them.

Thirdly, why, in the nine hundred and sixty-sixth year of the world, should there be more people than there are at present?

To explain this absurdity, we are told, that matters occurred otherwise than at present; that nature, being more vigorous, was better concocted and more prolific; and moreover that people lived longer. Why do they not add, that the sun was warmer, and the moon more beautiful?

We are told, that in the time of Cæsar, although men had begun to greatly degenerate, the world was like an ant's nest of bipeds; but that at present it is a

Digitized by Google

desart. Montesquieu, who always exaggerates, and who sacrifices anything to an itching desire of displaying his wit, ventures to believe, and in his Persian Letters would have others believe, that there were thirty times as many people in the world in the days of Cæsar as at present.

Wallace acknowledges, that this calculation made at random is too much; but for what reason? Because, before the days of Cæsar, the world possessed more inhabitants than during the most brilliant period of the Roman republic. He then ascends to the time of Semiramis, and if possible exaggerates more than Montesquieu.

Lastly, in conformity with the taste which is always attributed to the holy spirit for hyperbole, they fail not to instance the eleven hundred and sixty thousand men, who marched so fiercely under the standards of the great monarch Josophat, or Jehosophat, king of the province of Judah. Enough, enough, Mr. Wallace; the holy spirit cannot deceive; but its agents and copyists have badly calculated and numbered. All your Scotland would not furnish eleven hundred thousand men to attend your sermons, and the kingdom of Judah was not a twentieth part of Scotland. See again what St. Jerome says of this poor holy land, in which he so long resided. Have you well calculated the quantity of money the great king Jehosophat must have possessed, to pay, feed, clothe, and arm eleven hundred thousand chosen men? But thus is history written.

Mr. Wallace returns from Jehosophat to Cæsar, and concludes, that since the time of this dictator of short duration, the world has visibly decreased in the number of its inhabitants. Behold, said he, the Swiss: according to the relation of Cæsar, they amounted to three hundred and sixty-eight thousand, when they so wisely quitted their country to seek their fortunes, like the Cimbri.

I wish by this example to recal those partisans into a little due consideration, who gift the ancients with

Digitized by Google

such wonders in the way of generation, at the expense of the moderns. The canton of Berne alone, according to an accurate census, possesses a greater number of inhabitants than quitted the whole of Helvetia in the time of Cæsar. The human species is therefore doubled in Helvetia since that expedition.

I likewise believe, that Germany, France, and England are much better peopled now than at that time; and for this reason:—I adduce the vast clearance of forests, the number of great towns built and increased during the last eight hundred years, and the number of arts which have originated in proportion. This I regard as a sufficient answer to the brazen declamation, repeated every day in books, in which truth is sacrificed to sallies, and which are rendered useless by their abundant wit.

'L'ami des Hommes' says, that in the time of Cæsar fifty-two millions of men were assigned to Spain, which Strabo observes has always been badly peopled, owing to the interior being so deficient in water. Strabo is apparently right, and 'L'ami des Hommes' erroneous.

But they scare us by asking what has become of the prodigious quantity of Huns, Alains, Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Vandals, and Lombards, who spread like a torrent over Europe in the fifth century.

I distrust these multitudes, and suspect that twenty or thirty thousand ferocious animals, more or less, were sufficient to overwhelm with fright the whole Roman empire, governed by a Pulcheria, by eunuchs, and by monks. It was enough for ten thousand barbarians to pass the Danube; for every parish rumour, or homily, to make them more numerous than the locusts in the plains of Egypt; and call them a scourge from God, in order to inspire penitence, and produce gifts of money to the convents. Fear seized all the inhabitants, and they fled in crowds. Behold precisely the fright which a wolf caused in the district of Gevanden in the year 1766.

Mandrin the robber, at the head of fifty vaga-

Digitized by Google

bonds, put an entire town under contribution. As soon as he entered at one gate, it was said at the other, that he brought with him four thousand men and artillery.

If Attila, followed by fifty thousand hungry assassins, ravaged province after province, report would call them five hundred thousand.

The millions of men who followed Xerxes, Cyrus, Tomyris, the thirty or forty-four millions of Egyptians, Thebes with her hundred gates,—"Et quicquid Grecia mendax audet in historia,"—resemble the five hundred thousand men of Attila, which company of pleasant travellers it would have been difficult to find on the journey.

These Huns came from Siberia, and thence I conclude that they came in very small numbers. Siberia was certainly not more fertile than in our own days. I doubt whether in the reign of Tomyris a town existed equal to Tobolsk, or that these frightful deserts can feed a great number of inhabitants.

India, China, Persia, and Asia Minor, were thickly peopled; this I can credit without difficulty; and possibly they are not less so at presesent, notwithstanding the destructive prevalence of invasions and wars. Throughout, Nature has clothed them with pasturage; the bull freely unites with the heifer, the ram with the sheep, and man with woman.

The deserts of Barca, of Arabia, and of Oreb, of Sinai, of Jerusalem, of Cobi, &c. were never peopled, are not peopled at present, and never will be peopled; at least until some natural revolution happens to transform these plains of sand and flint into fertile land.

The land of France is tolerably good, and it is sufficiently inhabited by consumers, since of all kinds there are more than are well supplied; since there are two hundred thousand impostors, who beg from one end of the country to the other, and sustain their despicable lives at the expense of the rich; and lastly, since France supports more than eighty thousand

Digitized by Google

monks, of which not a single one assists to produce an ear of corn.*

SECTION II.

I believe that England, protestant Germany, and Holland, are better peopled in proportion than France. The reason is evident; those countries harbour not monks who vow to God to be useless to man. In these countries, the clergy, having little else to do, occupy themselves with study and propagation. They give birth to robust children, and give them a better education than that which is bestowed on the offspring of French and Italian marquesses.

Rome, on the contrary, would be a desert without cardinals, ambassadors, and travellers. It would be only an illustrious monument, like the temple of Jupiter Ammon. In the time of the first Cæsar, it was computed that this sterile territory, rendered fertile by manure and the labour of slaves, contained some millions of men. It was an exception to the general law, that population is ordinarily in proportion to fertility of soil.

Conquest rendered this barren country fertile and populous. A form of government as strange and contradictory as any which ever astonished mankind, has restored to the territory of Romulus its primitve character. The whole country is depopulated from Orvieto to Terracina. Rome, reduced to its own citizens, would be to London only as one to twelve; and in respect to money and commerce, would be to the towns of Amsterdam and London as one to a thousand.

That which Rome has lost, Europe has not only regained, but the population has almost tripled since the days of Charlemagne.

I say tripled, which is much; for propagation is not in geometrical progression. All the calculations made on the idea of this pretended multiplication, amount only to absurd chimeras.

* How many there are to be in future, remains to be seen. Of nuns we are just informed that there are to be 65,000, being so useful in *education* and works of charity!—T.

Digitized by Google

If a family of human beings or of apes multiplied in this manner, at the end of two hundred years the earth would not be able to contain them.

Nature has taken care at once to preserve and restrain the various species. She resembles the fates, who spin and cut threads continually. She is occupied with birth and destruction alone.

If she has given to man more ideas and memory than to other animals; if she has rendered him capable of generalising his ideas and combining them; if he has the advantage of the gift of speech, she has not bestowed upon him that of multiplication equal to insects. There are more ants in a square league of heath, than of men in the world, counting all that have ever existed.

When a country possesses a great number of idlers, be sure that it is well peopled; since these idlers are lodged, clothed, fed, amused, and respected, by those who labour.

The principal object however, is not to possess a superfluity of men, but to render such as we have as little unhappy as possible.

Let us thank nature for placing us in the temperate zone, peopled almost throughout by a more than sufficient number of inhabitants, who cultivate all the arts; and let us endeavour not to lessen this advantage by our absurdities.

SECTION III.

It must be confessed, that we ordinarily people and depopulate the world a little at random; and every body acts in this manner. We are little adapted to obtain an accurate notion of things; the *nearly* is our only guide, and it often leads us astray.

It is still worse when we wish to calculate precisely. We go and see farces and laugh at them; but should we laugh less in our closets when we read grave authors deciding exactly how many men existed on the earth two hundred and eighty-five years after the general deluge? We find, according to father Petau, that the family of Noah had produced one thousand two hun-

Digitized by Google

dred and twenty-four millions, seven hundred and seventeen thousand inhabitants, in three hundred years. The good priest Petau evidently knew little about getting children and rearing them, if we are to judge by this statement.

According to Cumberland, this family increased to three thousand three hundred and thirty millions, in three hundred and forty years; and according to Whiston, about three hundred years after the deluge, they amounted only to sixty-five millions four hundred and thirty-six.

It is difficult to reconcile and to estimate these accounts, such is the extravagance when people seek to make things accord which are repugnant, and to explain what is inexplicable. This unhappy endeavour has deranged heads which in other pursuits might have made discoveries beneficial to society.

The authors of the English Universal History observe, it is generally agreed that the present inhabitants of the earth amount to about four thousand millions. It is to be remarked, that these gentlemen do not include in this number the natives of America, which comprehends nearly half of the globe. For my own part, if, instead of a common romance, I wished to amuse myself by reckoning up the number of brethren I have on this unhappy little planet, I would proceed as follows. I would first endeavour to estimate pretty nearly the number of inhabited square leagues this earth contains on its surface; I should then say: The surface of the globe contains twenty-seven millions of square leagues; take away two thirds at least for seas, rivers, lakes, deserts, mountains, and all which is uninhabited: this calculation, which is very moderate, leaves us nine millions of square leagues to account for.

In France and Germany, there are said to be six hundred persons to a square league; in Spain, one hundred and fifty; in Russia, fifteen; and Tartary, ten. Take the mean number at an hundred, and you will have about nine hundred millions of brethren, including mulattoes, negroes, the brown, the copper-coloured, the fair, the bearded, and the unbearded. It is not thought

Digitized by Google

indeed, that the number is so great as this; and if eunuchs continue to be made, monks to multiply, and wars to be waged on the most trifling pretexts, it is easy to perceive that we shall not very soon be able to muster the four thousand millions, with which the English authors of the Universal History have so liberally favoured us; but then of what consequence is it, whether the number of men on the earth be great or small? The chief thing is to discover the means of rendering our miserable species as little unhappy as possible.

SECTION IV.

Of the Population of America.

The discovery of America—that field of so much avarice and so much ambition—has also become an object of philosophical curiosity. A great number of writers have endeavoured to prove that America was a colony of the ancient world. Some modest mathematicians, on the contrary, have said, that the same power which has caused the grass to grow in American soil, was able to place man there; but this simple and naked system has not been attended to.

When the great Columbus suspected the existence of this new world, it was held to be impossible; and Columbus was taken for a visionary. When it was really discovered, it was then found out that it had been known long before.

It was pretended that Martin Behem, a native of Nuremberg, quitted Flanders about the year 1460, in search of this unknown world; that he made his way even to the Straits of Magellan, of which he left unknown charts. As however it is certain that Martin Behem did not people America, it must certainly have been one of the later grand-children of Noah who took this trouble. All antiquity is then ransacked for accounts of long voyages, to which they apply the discovery of this fourth quarter of the globe. They make the ships of Solomon proceed to Mexico, and it is thence that he drew the gold of Ophir, to procure which he borrowed them from king Hiram. They find out

Digitized by Google

America in Plato, give the honour of it to the Carthagenians, and quote this anecdote from a book of Aristotle which he never wrote.

Hornius pretends to discover some conformity between the Hebrew language and that of the Caribs. Father Lafiteau, the jesuit, has not failed to follow up so fine an opening. The Mexicans, when greatly afflicted, tore their garments; certain people of Asia formerly did the same, and of course they are the ancestors of the Mexicans. It might be added, that the natives of Languedoc are very fond of dancing; and that as in their rejoicings the Hurons dance also, the Languedocians are descended from the Hurons, or the Hurons from the Languedocians.

The authors of a tremendous Universal History, pretend that all the Americans are descended from the Tartars. They assure us that this opinion is general among the learned, but they do not say whether it is so among the learned who reflect. According to them, some descendents of Noah could find nothing better to do, than to go and settle in the delicious country of Kamtschatka, in the north of Siberia. This family being destitute of occupation, resolved to visit Canada either by means of ships, or by marching pleasantly across some slip of connecting land, which has not been discovered in our own times. They then began to busy themselves in propagation, until the fine country of Canada soon becoming inadequate to the support of so numerous a population, they went to people Mexico, Peru, Chili; while certain of their great grand-daughters were in due time brought to bed of giants in the Straits of Magellan.

As ferocious animals are found in some of the warm countries of America, these authors pretend, that the Christopher Columbuses of Kamtschatka took them into Canada for their amusement, and carefully confined themselves to those kinds which are no longer to be found in the ancient hemisphere.

But the Kamtschatkans have not alone peopled the new world; they have been charitably assisted by the Mantchou Tartars, by the Huns, by the Chinese, and by the inhabitants of Japan.

Digitized by Google

The Mantchou Tartars are incontestably the ancestors of the Peruvians, for Mango Capac was the first inca of Peru. Mango resmbles Manco; Manco sounds like Mancu: Mancu approaches Mantchu, and Mantchou is very close to the latter. Nothing can be better demonstrated.

As for the Huns, they built in Hungary a town called Cunadi. Now, changing Cu into Ca, we have Canadi, from which Canada manifestly derives its name.

A plant resembling the Ginseng of the Chinese, grows in Canada, which the Chinese transplanted into the latter even before they were masters of the part of Tartary where it is indigenous. Moreover, the Chinese are such great navigators, they formerly sent fleets to America without maintaining the least correspondence with their colonies.

With respect to the Japanese, they are the nearest neighbours of America, which, as they are distant only about twelve hundred leagues, they have doubtless visited in their time, although latterly they have neglected repeating the voyage.

Thus is history written in our own days. What shall we say to these, and many other systems which resemble them? Nothing.

POSSESSED.

Of all those who boast of having leagues with the devil, to the possessed alone it is of no use to reply. If a man says to you, "I am possessed," you should believe it on his word. They are not obliged to do very extraordinary things; and when they do them, it is more than can fairly be demanded. What can we answer to a man who rolls his eyes, twists his mouth, and tells you that he has the devil within him? Every one feels what he feels; and as the world was formerly full of possessed persons, we may still meet with them. If they take measures to conquer the world, we give them property and they become more moderate; but for a poor demoniac, who is content with a few con-

Digitized by Google

vulsions and does no harm to any one, it is not right to make him injurious. If you dispute with him, you will infallibly have the worst of it. He will tell you, "The devil entered me to-day under such a form; from that time I have had a supernatural colic, which all the apothecaries in the world cannot assuage." There is certainly no other part to be taken with this man than to exorcise or abandon him to the devil.

It is a great pity that there are no longer possessed magicians or astrologers. We can conceive the cause of all these mysteries. An hundred years ago all the nobility then lived in their castles; the winter evenings are long, and they would have died of ennui without these noble amusements. There was scarcely a castle which a fairy did not visit on certain marked days, like the fairy Melusina at the castle of Lusignan. The great huntsman, a tall black man, hunted with a pack of black dogs in the forest of Fontainbleau. The devil twisted marshal Fabert's neck. Every village had its sorcerer or sorceress; every prince had his astrologer; all the ladies had their fortunes told; the possessed ran about the fields; it was who had seen the devil or could see him; all these things were inexhaustible subjects of conversation which kept minds in exercise. In the present day we insipidly play at cards, and we have lost by being undeceived.

POST.

Formerly, if you had one friend at Constantinople and another at Moscow, you would have been obliged to wait for their return before you could obtain any intelligence concerning them. At present, without either of you leaving your apartments, you may familiarly converse through the medium of a sheet of paper. You may even dispatch to them by the post, one of Arnault's sovereign remedies for apoplexy, which would be received much more infalliby, probably, than it would cure.

If one of your friends has occasion for a supply of money at Petersburgh, and the other at Smyrna,

Digitized by Google

the post will completely and rapidly effect your business.

Your mistress is at Bordeaux, while you are with your regiment before Prague; she gives you regular accounts of the constancy of her affections; you know from her all the news of the city, except her own infidelities.

In short, the post is the grand connecting link of all transactions, of all negociations. Those who are absent, by its means become present; it is the consolation of life.

France, where this beautiful invention was revived, even in our period of barbarism, has hereby conferred the most important service on all Europe. She has also never in any instance herself marred and tainted so valuable a benefit; and never has any minister who superintended the department of the post opened the letters of any individual, except when it was absolutely necessary that he should know their contents.* It is not thus, we are told, in other countries. It is asserted, that in Germany private letters, passing through the territories of five or six different governments, have been read just the same number of times, and that at last the seal has been so nearly destroyed, that it became necessary to substitute a new one.

Mr. Craggs, secretary of state in England, would never permit any person in his office to open private letters; he said that to do so was a breach of public faith, and that no man ought to possess himself of a secret that was not voluntarily confided to him; that it is often a greater crime to steal a man's thoughts than his gold; and that such treachery is proportionally more disgraceful, as it may be committed without danger, and without even the possibility of conviction.

To bewilder the eagerness of curiosity and defeat the vigilance of malice, a method was at first invented of writing a part of the contents of letters in cyphers; but the part written in the ordinary hand in this case

* This we apprehend is speaking by the card. Heaven defend us from the honour of the French post.—T.

Digitized by Google

sometimes served as a key to the rest. This inconvenience led to perfecting the art of cyphers, which is called 'stenography.'

Against these enigmatical productions was brought the art of decyphering; but this art was exceedingly defective and inefficient. The only advantage derived from it was exciting the belief in weak and ill-informed minds, that their letters had been decyphered, and all the pleasure it afforded consisted in giving such persons pain. According to the law of probabilities, in a well-constructed cypher there would be two, three, or even four hundred chances against one, that in each mark the decipherer would not discover the syllable of which it was the representative.

The number of chances increases in proportion to the complication of the cyphers; and decyphering is utterly impossible when the system is arranged with any ingenuity.

Those who boast that they can decypher a letter, without being at all acquainted with the subject of which it treats, and without any preliminary assistance, are greater charlatans than those who boast, if any such are to be found, of understanding a language which they never learned.

With respect to those who in a free and easy way send you by post a tragedy, in good round hand, with blank leaves, on which you are requested kindly to make your observations, or who in the same way regale you with a first volume of metaphysical researches, to be speedily followed by a second, we may just whisper in their ear, that a little more discretion would do no harm, and even that there are some countries where they would run some risk by thus informing the administration of the day, that there are such things in the world as bad poets and bad metaphysicians.

POWER—OMNIPOTENCE.

I PRESUME every reader of this article to be convinced that the world is formed with intelligence, and that a slight knowledge of astronomy and anatomy is

Digitized by Google

sufficient to produce admiration of that universal and supreme intelligence.

Once more I repeat, 'mens agitat molem.'*

Can the reader of himself ascertain that this intelligence is omnipotent, that is to say, infinitely powerful? Has he the slightest notion of infinity, to enable him to comprehend the meaning and extent of almighty power?

The celebrated philosophic historian, David Hume, says, "A weight of ten ounces is raised in a balance by another weight; this other weight therefore is more than ten ounces; but no one can rationally infer that it must necessarily be an hundred weight."†

We may fairly and judiciously apply here the same argument. You acknowledge a supreme intelligence sufficiently powerful to form yourself, to preserve you for a limited time in life, to reward you and to punish you. Are you sufficiently acquainted with it to be able to demonstrate that it can do more than this?

How can you prove by your reason, that a being can do more than it has actually done?

The life of all animals is short. Could he make it longer?

All animals are food for one another without exception; everything is born to be devoured. Could he form without destroying?

You know not what his nature is. It is impossible therefore that you should know, whether his nature may not have compelled him to do only the very things which he has done.

The globe on which we live is one vast field of destruction and carnage. Either the Supreme Being was able to make of it an eternal abode of enjoyment for all beings possessed of sensation, or he was not. If he was able and yet did not do it, you will undoubtedly tremble to pronounce or consider him a maleficent being; but if he was unable to do so, do not tremble to regard him as a power of very great extent indeed, but

* Virgil's Æneid, vi. 727. † Particular Providence, 350.

Digitized by Google

nevertheless circumscribed by his nature within certain limits.

Whether it be infinite or not, is not of any consequence to you. It is perfectly indifferent to a subject, whether his sovereign possesses five hundred leagues of territory or five thousand; he is in either case neither more nor less a subject.

Which would reflect most strongly on this great and ineffable being, to say, he made miserable beings because it was indispensable to do so; or, that he made them merely because it was his will and pleasure?

Many sects represent him as cruel; others, through fear of admitting the existence of a wicked deity, are daring enough to deny his existence at all. Would it not be far preferable to say, that probably the necessity of his own nature and that of things have determined everything?

The world is the theatre of moral and natural evil; this is too decidedly found and felt to be the case; and the 'all is for the best' of Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, and Pope, is nothing but the effusion of a mind devoted to eccentricity and paradox; in short, nothing but a dull jest.

The two principles of Zoroaster and Manes, so minutely investigated by Bayle, are a duller jest still. They are, as we have already observed, the two physicians of Molière, one of whom says to the other, You excuse my emetics, and I will excuse your bleedings. Manicheism is absurd; and that circumstance will account for its having had so many partisans.

I acknowledge that I have not had my mind enlightened by all that Bayle has said about the Manicheans and Paulicians. It is all controversy; what I wanted was pure philosophy. Why speak about our mysteries to Zoroaster? As soon as ever we have the temerity to discuss the critical subject of our mysteries, we open to our view the most tremendous precipices.

The trash of our own scholastic theology has nothing to do with the trash of Zoroaster's reveries.

Why discuss with Zoroaster the subject of original sin? That subject did not become a matter of dispute

Digitized by Google

until the time of St. Augustin. Neither Zoroaster, nor any other legislator of antiquity, ever heard it mentioned.

If you dispute with Zoroaster, lock up your Old and New Testament, with which he had not the slightest acquaintance, and which it is our duty to revere without attempting to explain.

What I should myself have said to Zoroaster would have been this:—My reason opposes the admission of two gods in conflict with each other; such an idea is allowable only in a poem in which Minerva quarrels with Mars. My weak understanding much more readily acquiesces in the notion of one only Great Being than in that of two great beings, of whom one is constantly counteracting and spoiling the operations of the other. Your evil principle, Arimanes, has not been able to derange a single astronomical and physical law established by the good principle of Oromazes; everything proceeds, among the numberless worlds which constitute what we call the heavens, with perfect regularity and harmony; how comes it that the malignant Arimanes has power only over this little globe of earth?

Had I been Arimanes, I should have assailed Oromazes in his immense and noble provinces, comprehending numbers of suns and stars. I should never have been content to confine the war to an insignificant and miserable village.

There certainly is a great deal of misery in this same village; but how can we possibly ascertain that it is not absolutely inevitable?

You are compelled to admit an intelligence diffused through the universe. But in the first place, do you absolutely know that this intelligence comprises a knowledge of the future? You have asserted a thousand times that it does; but you have never been able to prove it to me, or to comprehend it yourself. You connot have any idea how any being can see what does not exist; well, the future does not exist, therefore no being can see it. You are reduced to the necessity

Digitized by Google

of saying that he foresees it; but to foresee is only to conjecture.*

Now a God who, according to your system, conjectures, may be mistaken. He is, on your principles, really mistaken; for if he had foreseen that his enemy would poison all his works in this lower world, he would never have produced them; he would not have been accessary to the disgrace he sustains in being perpetually vanquished.

Secondly, is he not much more honoured upon my hypothesis, which maintains that he does everything by the necessity of his own nature, than upon yours, which raises up against him an enemy, disfiguring, polluting, and destroying all his works of wisdom and kindness throughout the world?

In the third place, it by no means implies a mean and unworthy idea of God to say that, after forming millions of worlds, in which death and evil may have no residence, it might be necessary that death and evil should reside in this.

Fourthly, it is not depreciating God to say, that he could not form man without bestowing on him self-love; that this self-love could not be his guide without almost always leading him astray; that his passions are necessary, but at the same time noxious; that the continuation of the species cannot be accomplished without desires; that these desires cannot operate without exciting quarrels; and that these quarrels necessarily bring on wars, &c.

Fifthly, on observing a part of the combinations of the vegetable, animal, and mineral kingdoms, and the porous nature of the earth, in every part so minutely pierced and drilled like a sieve, and from which exhalations constantly rise in immense profusion, what philosopher will be bold enough, what school-man will be weak enough, decidedly to maintain, that nature could possibly prevent the ravages of volcanoes, the intemperature of seasons, the rage of tempests, the poison of pestilence, or, in short, any of those scourges which afflict the world?

* This is the doctrine of the Socinians.

Digitized by Google

Sixthly, a very great degree of power and skill are required to form lions who devour bulls, and to produce men who invent arms which destroy, by a single blow, not merely the life of bulls and lions, but—melancholy as the idea is—the life of one another. Great power is necessary to produce the spiders which spread their exquisitely fine threads and net-work to catch flies; but this power amounts not to omnipotence—it is not boundless power.

In the seventh place, if the Supreme Being had been infinitely powerful, no reason can be assigned why he should not have made creatures endowed with sensation infinitely happy; he has not in fact done so; therefore we ought to conclude that he could not do so.

Eighthly, all the different sects of philosophers have struck on the rock of physical and moral evil. The only conclusion that can be securely reached is, that God, acting always for the best, has done the best that he was able to do.

Ninthly, this necessity cuts off all difficulties, and terminates all disputes. We have not the hardihood to say,—"All is good;" we say,—There is no more evil than was absolutely inevitable.

Tenthly, why do some infants die at the mother's breast? Why are others, after experiencing the first misfortune of being born, reserved for torments as lasting as their lives, which are at length ended by an appalling death?

Why has the source of life been poisoned throughout the world, since the discovery of America? Why, since the seventh century of the christian era, has the small-pox swept away an eighth portion of the human species? Why, in every age of the world, have human bladders been liable to be converted into stone quarries? Why pestilence, and war, and famine, and the inquisition? Consider the subject as carefully, as profoundly, as the powers of the mind will absolutely permit, you will find no other possible solution than that all is necessary.

I address myself here solely to philosophers, and not to divines. We know that faith is the clue to guide us through the labyrinth. We know full well, that the fall of Adam and Eve, original sin, the vast

Digitized by Google

power communicated to devils, the predilection entertained by the Supreme Being for the Jewish people, and the ceremony of baptism substituted for that of circumcision, are answers that clear up every difficulty. We have been here arguing only against Zoroaster, and not against the university of Coimbra, to whose decisions and doctrines, in all the articles of our work, we submit with all possible deference and faith.

See the Letters of Memmius to Cicero; and answer them if you can.

POWER.

The two Powers.

SECTION I.

WHOEVER holds both the sceptre and the censer has his hands completely occupied. If he governs a people possessed of common sense he may be considered as a very able man; but if his subjects have no more mind than children or savages, he may be compared to Bernier's coachman, who was one day suddenly surprised by his master in one of the public places of Delhi, haranguing the populace, and distributing among them his quack medicines. "What! Lapierre," says Bernier to him, "have you turned physician?" "Yes, sir," replied the coachman; "like people, like doctor."

The dairo of the Japanese, or the grand lama of Thibet, might make just the same remark. Even Numa Pompilius, with his Egeria, would have answered Bernier in the same manner. Melchisedec was probably in a similar situation, as well as the Anius whom Virgil introduces in the following two lines of the third book of his Æneid:—*

> Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos,
> Vittis et sacra redimitus tempora lauro.

> Anius, the priest and king, with laurel crown'd
> His hoary locks with purple fillets bound.
>
> DRYDEN.

This charlatan Anius was merely king of the isle of Delos, a very paltry kingdom, which, next to those of

* Verses 80, 81.

Digitized by Google

Melchisedec and Yvetot, was one of the least considerable in the world; but the worship of Apollo had conferred on it a high reputation; a single saint is enough to raise any country into credit and consequence.

Three of the German electors are more powerful than Anius, and like him unite the rights of the mitre with those of the crown; although in subordination, at least apparently so, to the Roman emperor, who is no other than the emperor of Germany. But of all the countries in which the plenitude of ecclesiastical, and the plenitude of royal claims, combine to form the most full and complete power that can be imagined, modern Rome is the chief.

The pope is regarded in the catholic part of Europe as the first of kings and the first of priests. It was the same in what was called 'pagan' Rome; Julius Cæsar was at once chief pontiff, dictator, warrior, and conqueror; distinguished also both for eloquence and gallantry; in every respect the first of mankind; and with whom no modern, except in a dedication, could ever be compared.

The king of England, being the head also of the church, possesses nearly the same dignities as the pope.

The empress of Russia is likewise absolute mistress over her clergy, in the largest empire existing upon earth. The notion that two powers may exist, in opposition to each other, in the same state, is there regarded even by the clergy themselves as a chimera equally absurd and pernicious.

In this connection I cannot help introducing a letter which the empress of Russia, Catherine II., did me the honour to write to me at Mount Krapak, on the 22d of August 1765, and which she permitted me to make use of as I might see occasion.

"The capuchins who are tolerated at Moscow (for toleration is general throughout the Russian empire, and the jesuits alone are not suffered to remain in it),*

* The jesuits have been tolerated there since they were abolished by the pope; as they can now be no longer dangerous.—*French Ed.* Query.—T.

Digitized by Google

having, in the course of the last winter, obstinately refused to inter a Frenchman who died suddenly, under a pretence that he had not received the sacraments, Abraham Chaumeix drew up a factum, or statement against them, in order to prove to them that it was obligatory upon them to bury the dead. But neither this factum, nor two requisitions of the governor, could prevail upon these fathers to obey. At last they were authoritatively told that they must either bury the Frenchman, or remove beyond the frontiers. They actually removed accordingly; and I sent some Augustins from this place, who were somewhat more tractable, and who perceiving that no trifling or delay would be permitted, did all that was desired on the occasion. Thus Abraham Chaumeix has in Russia become a reasonable man; he absolutely is an enemy to persecution: were he also to become a man of wit and intellect, he would make the most incredulous believe in miracles; but all the miracles in the world will not blot out the disgrace of having been the denouncer of the Encyclopedia. . . . .

"The subjects of the church, having suffered many, and frequently tyrannical, grievances, which the frequent change of masters very considerably increased, towards the end of the reign of the empress Elizabeth rose in actual rebellion; and at my accession to the throne, there were more than an hundred thousand men in arms. This occasioned me, in 1762, to execute the project of changing entirely the administration of the property of the clergy, and to settle upon them fixed revenues. Arsenius, bishop of Rostow, strenuously opposed this, urged on by some of his brother clergy, who did not feel it perfectly convenient to put themselves forward by name. He sent in two memorials, in which he attempted to establish the absurd principle of two powers. He had made the like attempt before, in the time of the empress Elizabeth, when he had been simply enjoined silence; but his insolence and folly redoubling, he was now tried by the metropolitan of Novogorod and the whole synod, condemned as a fanatic, found guilty of attempts contrary to the orthodox faith as well as to the supreme power, deprived of his dignity

Digitized by Google

and priesthood, and delivered over to the secular arm. I acted leniently towards him; and after reducing him to the situation of a monk, extended his punishment no farther."

Such are the very words of the empress; and the inference from the whole case is, that she well knows both how to support the church and how to restrain it; that she respects humanity as well as religion; that she protects the labourer as well as the priest; and that all orders in the state ought both to admire and to bless her.

I shall hope to be excused for the farther indiscretion of transcribing here a passage contained in another of her letters, written on the twenty-eighth of November, in 1765.

"Toleration is established among us; it constitutes a law of the state: persecution is prohibited. We have indeed fanatics who, as they are not persecuted by others, burn themselves; but if those of other countries also did the same, no great harm could result; the world, in consequence of such a system, would have been more tranquil, and Calas would not have been racked to death."

Do not imagine that she writes in this style from a feeling of transient and vain enthusiasm, contradicted afterwards in her practice, nor even from a laudable desire of obtaining throughout Europe the suffrages and applause of those who think, and teach others the way to think. She lays down these principles as the basis of her government. She wrote with her own hand, in the Council of Legislations, the following words, which should be engraved on the gates of every city in the world.

"In a great empire, extending its sway over as many different nations as there are different creeds among mankind, the most pernicious fault would be intolerance."

It is to be observed, that she does not hesitate to put intolerance in the rank of faults—I had nearly said offences. Thus does an absolute empress, in the depths of the north, put an end to persecution and slavery;—while in the south. . . . . .

Digitized by Google

*Judge for yourself, sir, after this, whether there will be found a man in Europe who will not be ready to sign the eulogium you propose. Not only is this princess tolerant, but she is desirous that her neighbours should be so likewise. This is the first instance in which supreme power has been exercised in establishing liberty of conscience. It constitutes the grandest epoch with which I am acquainted in modern history.

The case of the ancient Persians forbidding the Carthaginians to offer human sacrifices, is a somewhat similar instance.

Would to God, that instead of the barbarians who formerly poured from the plains of Scythia, and the mountains of Imaus and Caucasus, towards the Alps and Pyrennees, carrying with them ravage and desolation, armies might be seen at the present day descending to subvert the tribunal of the inquisition—a tribunal more horrible than even the sacrifices of human beings which constitute the eternal reproach of our forefathers.

In short, this superior genius wishes to convince her neighbours of what Europe is now beginning to comprehend, that metaphysical unintelligible opinions, which are the daughters of absurdity, are the mothers of discord; and that the church, instead saying—I come to bring, not peace, but the sword—should exclaim aloud, I bring peace, and not the sword. Accordingly, the empress is unwilling to draw the sword against any but those who wish to crush the dissidents.

SECTION II.

Conversation between the reverend Father Bouvet, Missionary of the Company of Jesus, and the Emperor Camhi, in the presence of Brother Attiret, a Jesuit; extracted from the Private Memoirs of the Mission, in 1772.

FATHER BOUVET.

Yes, may it please your sacred majesty, as soon as you will have had the happiness of being baptised by

* This is a part of a letter from a citizen of Mount Krapac, which contains the extract from the empress' letter.

Digitized by Google

me, which I hope will be the case, you will be relieved of one half of the immense burden which now oppresses you. I have mentioned to you the fable of Atlas who supported the heavens upon his shoulders. Hercules relieved him, and carried away the heavens. You are Atlas, and Hercules is the pope. There will be two powers in your empire. Our excellent Clement will be the first. Upon this plan you will enjoy the greatest of all advantages; those of being at leisure while you live, and of being saved when you die.

THE EMPEROR.

I am exceedingly obliged to my dear friend the pope, for condescending to take so much trouble; but how will he be able to govern my empire at the distance of six thousand leagues?

FATHER BOUVET.

Nothing, may it please your imperial majesty, can be more easy. We are his vicars apostolic, and he is the vicar of God; you will therefore be governed by God himself.

THE EMPEROR.

How delightful that will be! I am not however quite easy upon the subject. Will your vice-god share the imperial revenues with myself? For all labour ought to be paid for.

FATHER BOUVET.

Our vice-god is so kind and good, that in general he will not take, at most, more than a quarter, except in cases of disobedience. Our emoluments will not exceed fifty million ounces of pure silver, which is surely a trifling object in comparison with heavenly advantages.

THE EMPEROR.

Yes, it is certainly, as you say, giving them almost for nothing. I suppose your celebrated and benevolent city derives just about the same sum from each of my three neighbours, the great Mogul, the emperor of Japan, and the empress of Russia; and also from the Persian and the Turkish empires?

FATHER BOUVET.

I cannot exactly say, that is yet the case; but,

Digitized by Google

with God's help and our own, I have no doubt it will be so.

THE EMPEROR.

And how are you, who are the vicars apostolic, to be paid?

FATHER BOUVET.

We have no regular wages; but we are somewhat like the principal female character in a comedy written by one count Caylus, a countryman of mine; all that I . . . . is for myself.

THE EMPEROR.

But pray inform me, whether your christian princes in Europe pay your Italian friend or patron in proportion to the assessment laid on me?

FATHER BOUVET.

No, they do not! One half of Europe has separated from him, and pays him nothing; and the other pays him no more than it is obliged to pay.

THE EMPEROR.

You told me some time since, that he was sovereign of a very fine and fertile territory.

FATHER BOUVET.

Yes; but it produces very little to him: it lies mostly uncultivated.

THE EMPEROR.

Poor man! he does not know how to cultivate his own territory, and yet pretends to govern mine.

FATHER BOUVET.

Formerly, in one of our councils, that is, in one of our assemblies of priests, which was held in a city called Constance, our holy father caused a proposition to be made for a new tax, for the support of his dignity. The assembly replied, that any necessity for that would be perfectly precluded by his attending to the cultivation of his own lands. This however he took effectual care not to do. He preferred living on the produce of those who labour in other kingdoms. He appeared to think, that this manner of living had an air of greater grandeur.

THE EMPEROR.

Well, go and tell him from me, that I not only

Digitized by Google

make those about me labour, but that I also labour myself; and I doubt much whether it will be for him.

FATHER BOUVET.

Holy virgin! I am absolutely taken for a fool.

THE EMPEROR.

Begone, this instant! I have been too indulgent.

BROTHER ATTIRET, TO FATHER BOUVET.

I was right, you see, when I told you, that the emperor, with all his excellence of heart, had also more understanding than both of us together.

PRAYER (PUBLIC), THANKSGIVING, &c.

VERY few forms of public prayers used by the ancients still remain.

We have only Horace's beautiful hymn for the secular games of the ancient Romans. This prayer is in the rhythm and measure which the other Romans long after imitated inthe hymn, "Ut queat laxis resonare fibris."

The "Pervigilium Veneris" is written in a quaint and affected taste, and seems unworthy of the noble simplicity of the reign of Augustus. It is possible that this hymn to Venus may have been chaunted in the festivals celebrated in honour of that goddess; but it cannot be doubted, that the poem of Horace was chaunted with much greater solemnity.

It must be allowed, that this secular poem of Horace is one of the finest productions of antiquity; and that the hymn "Ut queat laxis," is one of the most flat and vapid pieces that appeared during the barbarous period of the decline of the Latin language. The catholic church in those times paid little attention to eloquence and poetry. We all know very well that God prefers bad verses recited with a pure heart, to the finest verses possible chaunted by the wicked. Good verses however never yet did any harm, and—all other things being equal—must deserve a preference.

Nothing among us ever approached the secular games, which were celebrated at the expiration of every hundred and ten years. Our jubilee is only a faint and feeble copy of it. Three magnificent altars were erec-

Digitized by Google

ted on the banks of the Tiber. All Rome was illuminated for three successive nights; and fifteen priests distributed the lustral water and wax tapers among the men and women of the city who were appointed to chaunt the prayers. A sacrifice was first offered to Jupiter as the great god, the sovereign master of the gods, and afterwards to Juno, Apollo, Latona, Diana, Ceres, Pluto, Proserpine, and the Fates, as to inferior powers. All these divinities had their own peculiar hymns and ceremonies. There were two choirs, one of twenty-seven boys, and the other of twenty-seven girls, for each of the divinities. Finally, on the last day, the boys and girls, crowned with flowers, chaunted the ode of Horace.

It is true, that in private houses his other odes, for Ligurinus and Liciscus and other contemptible characters, were heard at table; performances which undoubtedly were not calculated to excite the finest feelings of devotion; but there is a time for all things, "pictoribus atque poetis." Caraccio, who drew the figures of Aretin, painted saints also; and in all our colleges we have excused in Horace what the masters of the Roman empire excused in him without any difficulty.

As to forms of prayer, we have only a few slight fragments of that which was recited at the mysteries of Isis. We have quoted it elsewhere, but we will repeat it here, because it is at once short and beautiful.

"The celestial powers obey thee; hell is in subjection to thee; the universe revolves under thy moving hand; thy feet tread on Tartarus; the stars are responsive to thy voice; the seasons return at thy command; the elements are obedient to thy will."

We repeat also the form supposed to have been used in the worship of the ancient Orpheus, which we think superior even to the above respecting Isis.

"Walk in the path of justice; adore the sole master of the universe; he is one alone, and self-existent; all other beings owe their existence to him; he acts both in them and by them; he sees all, but has never been himself seen by mortal eyes."

It is not a little extraordinary, that in the Leviticus

Digitized by Google

and Deuteronomy of the Jews, there is not a single public prayer, not one single formula of public worship. It seems as if the Levites were fully employed in dividing among themselves the viands that were offered to them. We do not even see a single prayer instituted for their great festivals of the passover, the penticost, the trumpets, the tabernacles, the general expiation, or the new moon.

The learned are almost unanimously agreed, that there were no regular prayers among the Jews, except when, during their captivity at Babylon, they adopted somewhat of the manners, and acquired something of the sciences, of that civilized and powerful people. They borrowed all from the Chaldaic Persians, even to their very language, characters, and numerals; and joining some new customs to their old Egyptian rites, they became a new people, so much the more superstitious than before, in consequence of their being, after the conclusion of a long captivity, still always dependent upon their neighbours.

> . . . . . In rebus acerbis
> Acrius advertunt animos ad religionem.
> LUCRETIUS, book iii. 52. 53.

> . . . . . The common rout,
> When cares and dangers press, grow more devout.
> CREECH.

With respect to the ten other tribes who had been previously dispersed, we may reasonably believe that they were as destitute of public forms of prayer as the two others, and that they had not, even up to the period of their dispersion, any fixed and well-defined religion, as they abandoned that which they professed with so much facility, and forgot even their own name, which cannot be said of the small number of unfortunate beings who returned to re-build Jerusalem.

It is therefore at that period that the two tribes, or rather the two tribes and a half, seemed to have first attached themselves to certain invariable rights, to have written books, and used regular prayers. It is not before that time that we begin to see among them forms of prayer. Esdras ordained two prayers for every day,

Digitized by Google

and added a third for the sabbath; it is even said, that he instituted eighteen prayers, that there might be room for selection, and also to afford variety in the service. The first of these begins in the following manner:—

"Blessed be thou, O Lord God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the great God, the powerful, the terrible, the most high, the liberal distributor of good things, the former and possessor of the world, who rememberest good actions, and sendest a redeemer to their descendants for thy name's sake. O King, our help and saviour, our buckler, blessed be thou, O Lord, the buckler of our father Abraham."

It is asserted that Gamaliel, who lived in the time of Jesus Christ, and who had such violent quarrels with St. Paul, ordered a nineteenth prayer, which is as follows:—

"Grant peace, benefits, blessing, favour, kindness, and piety to us, and to thy people Israel. Bless us, O our Father! bless us altogether with the light of thy countenance; for by the light of thy countenance thou hast given us, O Lord our God, the law of life, love, kindness, equity, blessing, piety, and peace. May it please thee to bless, through all time, and at every moment, thy people Israel, by giving them peace. Blessed be thou, O Lord who blessest thy people Israel by giving them peace. Amen.*"

There is one circumstance deserving of remark with regard to many prayers, which is, that every nation has prayed for the direct contrary events to those prayed for by their neighbours.

The Jews, for example, prayed that God would exterminate the Syrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians; and these prayed that God would exterminate the Jews; and, accordingly, they may be said to have been so, with respect to the ten tribes, who have been confounded and mixed up with so many nations; and the remaining two tribes were more unfortunate still; for, as they obstinately persevered in

* Consult, on this subject, the first and second volumes of the Misha.

Digitized by Google

remaining separate from all other nations in the midst of whom they dwelt, they were deprived of the grand advantages of human society.

In our own times, in the course of the wars that we so frequently undertake for the sake of particular cities, or even perhaps villages, the Germans and Spaniards, when they happened to be the enemies of the French, prayed to the holy virgin, from the bottom of their hearts, that she would completely defeat the Gauls and the Gavaches, who in their turn supplicated her, with equal importunity, to destroy the Maranes and the Teutons.

In England, advocates of the red rose offered up to St. George the most ardent prayers, to prevail upon him to sink all the partisans of the white rose to the bottom of the sea. The white rose was equally devout and importunate for the very opposite event. We can all of us have some idea of the embarrassment which this must have occasioned to St. George; and if Henry VII. had not come to his assistance, St. George would never have been able to get extricated from it.

SECTION II.

We know of no religion without prayers; even the Jews had them, although there was no public form of prayer among them before the time when they sang their canticles in their synagogues, which did not take place until a late period.

The people of all nations, whether actuated by desires or fears, have invoked the assistance of the Divinity. Philosophers however, more respectful to the Supreme Being, and rising more above human weakness, have been habituated to substitute, for prayer, resignation. This in fact is all that appears proper and suitable between creature and Creator. But philosophy is not adapted to the great mass of mankind; it soars too highly above the vulgar; it speaks a language they are unable to comprehend. To propose philosophy to them would be just as weak as to propose the study of conic sections to peasants or fishwomen.

Digitized by Google

Among philosophers themselves, I know of no one besides Maximus Tyrius who has treated of this subject. The following is the substance of his ideas upon it:—

The designs of God exist from all eternity. If the object prayed for be conformable to his immutable will, it must be perfectly useless to request of him the very thing which he has determined to do. If he is prayed to for the reverse of what he has determined to do, he is prayed to be weak, fickle, and inconstant; such a prayer implies that this is thought to be his character, and is nothing better than ridicule or mockery of him. You either request of him what is just and right, in which case he ought to do it, and it will be actually done without any solicitation, which in fact shows distrust of his rectitude; or what you request is unjust, and then you insult him. You are either worthy or unworthy of the favour you implore: if worthy, he knows it better than you do yourself; if unworthy, you commit an additional crime in requesting that which you do not merit.

In a word, we offer up prayers to God only because we have made him after our own image. We treat him like a pacha, or a sultan, who is capable of being exasperated and appeased.

In short, all nations pray to God: the sage is resigned, and obeys him.

Let us pray with the people, and let us be resigned to him with the sage.

We have already spoken of the public prayers of many nations, and of those of the Jews. That people have had one from time immemorial, which deserves all our attention, from its resemblance to the prayer taught us by Jesus Christ himself. This Jewish prayer is called the Kadish, and begins with these words:—"O, God! let thy name be magnified and sanctified; make thy kingdom to prevail; let redemption flourish, and the Messiah come quickly!"

As this Kadish is recited in Chaldee, it is has induced the belief, that it is as ancient as the captivity, and that it was at that period that the Jews began to hope

Digitized by Google

for a Messiah, a Liberator, or Redeemer, whom they have since prayed for in the seasons of their calamities.

The circumstance of this word Messiah being found in this ancient prayer, has occasioned much controversy on the subject of the history of this people. If the prayer originated during the Babylonish captivity, it is evident that the Jews at that time must have hoped for and expected a Redeemer. But whence does it arise, that in times more dreadfully calamitous still, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, neither Josephus nor Philo ever mentioned any expectation of a Messiah? There are obscurities in the history of every people; but those of the Jews form an absolute and perpetual chaos. It is unfortunate for those who are desirous of information, that the Chaldeans and Egyptians have lost their archives, while the Jews have preserved theirs.

PREJUDICE.

Prejudice is an opinion without judgment. Thus, throughout the world, children are inspired with opinions before they can judge.

There are universal and necessary prejudices, and these even constitute virtue. In all countries children are taught to acknowledge a rewarding and punishing God; to respect and love their fathers and mothers; to regard theft as a crime, and interested lying as a vice, before they can tell what is a virtue or a vice.

Prejudice may therefore be very useful, and such as judgment will ratify when we reason.

Sentiment is not simply prejudice, it is something much stronger. A mother loves not her son because she is told that she must love him; she fortunately cherishes him in spite of herself. It is not through prejudice that you run to the aid of an unknown child nearly falling down a precipice, or being devoured by a beast.

But it is through prejudice that you will respect a man dressed in certain clothes, walking gravely, and

Digitized by Google

talking at the same time. Your parents have told you that you must bend to this man; you respect him before you know whether he merits your respect; you grow in age and knowledge; you perceive that this man is a quack, made up of pride, interest, and artifice; you despise that which you revered, and prejudice yields to judgment. Through prejudice, you have believed the fables with which your infancy was lulled; you are told that the Titans made war against the gods, that Venus was amorous of Adonis; at twelve years of age you take these fables for truth, at twenty, you regard them as ingenious allegories.

Let us examine, in a few words, the different kinds of prejudices, in order to arrange our ideas. We shall perhaps be like those, who, in the time of the scheme of Law, perceived that they had calculated upon imaginary riches.

Prejudices of the Senses.

Is it not an amusing thing, that our eyes always deceive us, even when we see very well, and that on the contrary our ears do not? When your properly formed ear hears—"You are beautiful; I love you"—it is very certain that the words are not—"I hate you; you are ugly;" but you see a smooth mirror—it is demonstrated that you are deceived; it is a very rough surface. You see the sun about two feet in diameter; it is demonstrated that it is a million times larger than the earth.

It seems that God has put truth into your ears, and error into your eyes; but study optics, and you will perceive that God has not deceived you, and that it was impossible for objects to appear to you otherwise than you see them in the present state of things.

Physical Prejudices.

The sun rises, the moon also, the earth is immovable; these are natural physical prejudices. But that crabs are good for the blood, because when boiled they are of the same colour; that eels cure paralysis, because they frisk about; that the moon influences our diseases, because an invalid was one day observed to

Digitized by Google

have an increase of fever during the wane of the moon: these ideas and a thousand others were the errors of ancient charlatans, who judged without reasoning, and who, being themselves deceived, deceived others.

Historical Prejudices.

The greater part of historians have believed without examining, and this confidence is a prejudice. Fabius Pictor relates, that several ages before him a vestal of the town of Alba, going to draw water in her pitcher, was violated, that she was delivered of Romulus and Remus, that they were nourished by a she-wolf. The Roman people believed this fable; they examined not whether at that time there were vestals in Latium; whether it was likely that the daughter of a king should go out of her convent with a pitcher, or whether it was probable that a she-wolf should suckle two children, instead of eating them: prejudice established it.

A monk writes, that Clovis being in great danger at the battle of Tolbiac, made a vow to become a christian if he escaped; but is it natural that he should address a strange god on such an occasion? Would not the religion in which he was born have acted the most powerfully? Where is the christian who, in a battle against the Turks, would not rather address himself to the holy virgin Mary, than to Mahomet? He adds, that a pigeon brought the phial in his beak to anoint Clovis, and that an angel brought the oriflamme to conduct him: the prejudiced believed all the stories of this kind. Those who are acquainted with human nature well know, that the usurper Clovis, and the usurper Rollo, or Rol, became christians to govern the christians more securely, as the Turkish usurpers became mussulmans to govern the mussulmans more securely.

Religious Prejudices.

If your nurse has told you, that Ceres presides over corn, or that Vishnou and Xaca became men several times, or that Sammonocodom cut down a forest, or that Odin expects you in his hall near Jutland, or that Mahomet, or some other, made a journey to heaven:

Digitized by Google

finally, if your preceptor afterwards thrusts into your brain what your nurse has engraven on it, you will possess it for life. If your judgment would rise above these prejudices, your neighbours, and above all the ladies, exclaim "impiety," and frighten you; your dervise, fearing to see his revenue diminished, accuses you before the cadi; and this cadi, if he can, causes you to be impaled, because he would command fools, and he believes that fools obey better than others; which state of things will last until your neighbours and the dervise and cadi begin to comprehend, that folly is good for nothing, and that persecution is abominable.

PRESBYTERIAN.

The Anglican religion is predominant only in England and Ireland; presbyterianism is the established religion of Scotland. This presbyterianism is nothing more than pure Calvinism, such as at once existed in France, and still exists at Geneva.

In comparison with a young and lively French bachelor in divinity, brawling during the morning in the schools of theology, and singing with the ladies in the evening, a church-of-England divine is a Cato; but this Cato is himself a gallant in the presence of the Scottish presbyterians. The latter affect a solemn walk, a serious demeanour, a large hat, a long robe beneath a short one, and preach through the nose. All churches in which the ecclesiastics are so happy as to receive an annual income of fifty thousand livres, and to be addressed by the people as "my lord," "your grace," or "your eminence," they denominate the whore of Babylon.* These gentlemen have also several churches in England, where they maintain the same manners and gravity as in Scotland. It is to them chiefly that the English are indebted for the strict sanctification of Sunday throughout the three kingdoms. They are forbidden either to labour or to amuse themselves. No opera, no concert, no comedy in Lon-

* It need not be said that something of this has abated since the time of Voltaire.—T.

Digitized by Google

don on a Sunday. Even cards are expressly forbidden; and there are only certain people of quality who are deemed open souls who play on that day. The restof the nation attend sermons, taverns, and their small affairs of love.

Although episcopacy and presbyterianism predominate in Great Britain, all other opinions are welcome and live tolerably well together, although the various preachers reciprocally detest each other with nearly the same cordiality as a jansenist damns a jesuit.

Enter into the Royal Exchange of London, a place more respectable than many courts, in which deputies from all nations assemble for the advantage of mankind. There the Jew, the Mahometan, and the Christian, bargain with one another as if they were of the same religion, and bestow the name of infidel upon bankrupts only. There the presbyterian gives credit to the anabaptist, and the votary of the establishment accepts the promise of the quaker. On the separation of these free and pacific assemblies, some visit the synagogue, others repair to the tavern. Here one proceeds to baptise his son in a great tub, in the name of the father, son, and holy ghost; there another deprives his boy of a small portion of his foreskin, and mutters over the child some Hebrew words which he cannot understand; a third kind hasten to their chapels to wait for the inspiration of the Lord with their hats on; and all are content.

Was there in England but one religion, despotism might be apprehended; if two only, they would seek to cut each other's throats; but as there are at least thirty, they live together in peace and happiness.

PRETENSIONS.

There is not a single prince in Europe who does not assume the title of sovereign of a country possessed by his neighbour. This political madness is unknown in the rest of the world. The king of Boutan never called himself emperor of China; nor did the so-

Digitized by Google

vereign of Tartary ever assume the title of king of Egypt.

The most splendid and comprehensive pretensions have always been those of the popes; two keys, saltier, gave them clear and decided possession of the kingdom of heaven. They bound and unbound everything on earth. This ligature made them masters of the continent; and St. Peter's nets gave them the dominion of the seas.

Many learned theologians thought, that when these gods were assailed by the Titans, called Lutherans, Anglicans, and Calvinists, &c., they themselves reduced some articles of their pretensions. It is certain that many of them became more modest, and that their celestial court attended more to propriety and decency; but their pretensions were renewed on every opportunity that offered. No other proof is necessary than the conduct of Aldobrandini, Clement VIII., to the great Henry IV., when it was deemed necessary to give him an absolution that he had no occasion for, on account of his being already absolved by the bishops of his own kingdom, and also on account of his being victorious.

Aldobrandini at first resisted for a whole year, and refused to acknowledge the duke of Nemours as the ambassador of France. At last he consented to open to Henry the gate of the kingdom of heaven, on the following conditions:—

1. That Henry should ask pardon for having made the sub-porters, that is the bishops, open the gate to him, instead of applying to the grand porter.

2. That he should acknowledge himself to have forfeited the throne of France till Aldobrandini, by the plenitude of his power, reinstated him on it.

3. That he should be a second time consecrated and crowned; the first coronation having been null and void, as they were performed without the express order of Aldobrandini.

4. That he should expel all the protestants from his kingdom; which would have been neither honourable nor possible. It would not have been honourable, be-

Digitized by Google

cause the protestants had profusely shed their blood to establish him as king of France; and it would not have been possible, as the number of these dissidents amounted to two millions.

5. That he should immediately make war on the grand Turk, which would not have been more honourable or possible than the last condition, as the grand Turk had recognised him as king of France at a time when Rome refused to do so, and as Henry had neither troops, nor money, nor ships, to engage in such an insane war with his faithful ally.

6. That he should receive in an attitude of complete prostration the absolution of the pope's legate, according to the usual form in which it is administered; that is in fact, that he should be actually scourged by the legate.

7. That he should recal the jesuits, who had been expelled from his kingdom by the parliament for the attempt made to assassinate him by Jean Chatel, their scholar.

I omit many other minor pretensions. Henry obtained a mitigation of a number of them. In particular, he obtained the concession, although with a great deal of difficulty, that the scourging should be inflicted only by proxy, and by the hand of Aldobrandini himself.

You will perhaps tell me, that his holiness was obliged to require those extravagant conditions by that old and inveterate demon of the south, Philip II., who was more powerful at Rome than the pope himself. You compare Aldobrandini to a contemptible poltroon of a soldier whom his colonel forces forward to the trenches by caning him.

To this I answer, that Clement VIII. was indeed afraid of Philip II., but that he was not less attached to the rights of the tiara; and that it was so exquisite a gratification for the grandson of a banker to scourge a king of France, that Aldobrandini would not altogether have conceded this point for the world.

You will reply, that should a pope at present renew such pretensions, should he now attempt to apply the scourge to a king of France, or Spain, or Naples, or

Digitized by Google

to a duke of Parma, for having driven the reverend fathers the jesuits from their dominions, he would be in imminent danger of incurring the same treatment as Clement VII. did from Charles V., and even of experiencing still greater humiliations;—that it is necessary to sacrifice pretensions to interests; that men must yield to times and circumstances; and that the sheriff of Mecca must proclaim Ali Beg king of Egypt, if he is successful and firm upon the throne. To this I answer, that you are perfectly right.

Pretensions of the Empire; extracted from Glafey and Schwedar.

Upon Rome (none). Even Charles V., after he had taken Rome, claimed no right of actual domain.

Upon the patrimony of St. Peter, from Viterbo to Civita Castellana, the estates of the Countess Matilda, but solemnly ceded by Rodolph of Hapsburg.

Upon Parma and Placentia, the supreme dominion as part of Lombardy, invaded by Julius II., granted by Paul III. to his bastard Farnese: homage always paid for them to the pope from that time; the sovereignty always claimed by the seigneurs of Lombardy; the right of sovereignty completely ceded to the emperor by the treaties of Cambray and of London, at the peace of 1737.

Upon Tuscany, right of sovereignty exercised by Charles V.; an estate of the empire, belonging now to the emperor's brother.

Upon the republic of Lucca, erected into a duchy by Louis of Bavaria in 1328; the senators declared afterwards vicars of the empire by Charles IV. The emperor Charles VI. however, in the war of 1701, exercised in it his right of sovereignty by levying upon it a large contribution.

Upon the duchy of Milan, ceded by the emperor Wincenslaus to Galeas Visconti, but considered as a fief of the empire.

Upon the duchy of Mirandola, reunited to the house of Austria in 1711 by Joseph I.

Digitized by Google

Upon the duchy of Mantua, erected into a duchy by Charles V; reunited in like manner in 1708.

Upon Guastalla, Novellaria, Bozzolo, and Castiglione, also fiefs of the empire, detached from the duchy of Mantua.

Upon the whole of Montserrat, of which the duke of Savoy received the investiture at Vienna in 1708.

Upon Piedmont, the investiture of which was bestowed by the emperor Sigismund on the duke of Savoy, Amadeus VIII.

Upon the county of Asti, bestowed by Charles V. on the house of Savoy: the dukes of Savoy always vicars in Italy from the time of the emperor Sigismund.

Upon Genoa, formerly part of the domain of the Lombard kings. Frederick Barbarossa granted to it in fief the coast from Monaco to Porta-Venere; it is free under Charles V. in 1529; but the words of the instrument are "In civitate nostra Genoa, et salvis romani imperii juribus."

Upon the fiefs of Langues, of which the dukes of Savoy have the direct domain.

Upon Padua, Vicenza, and Verona, rights fallen into neglect.

Upon Naples and Sicily, rights still more fallen into neglect. Almost all the states of Italy are or have been in vassalage to the empire.

Upon Pomerania and Mecklenburg, the fiefs of which were granted by Frederick Barbarossa.

Upon Denmark, formerly a fief of the empire; Otho I. granted the investiture of it.

Upon Poland, for the territory on the banks of the Vistula.

Upon Bohemia and Silesia, united to the empire by Charles IV. in 1355.

Upon Prussia, from the time of Henry VII.: the grand master of Prussia acknowledged a member of the empire in 1500.

Upon Livonia, from the time of the knights of the sword.

Upon Hungary, from the time of Henry II.

Upon Lorraine, by the treaty of 1542; acknowledged

Digitized by Google

an estate of the empire, paying taxes to support the war against the Turks.

Upon the duchy of Bar down to the year 1311, when Philip the Fair, who conquered it, did homage for it.

Upon the duchy of Burgundy, by virtue of the rights of Mary of Burgundy.

Upon the kingdom of Arles and Burgundy on the other side of the Jura, which Conrad the Salian, possessed in chief by his wife.

Upon Dauphiny, as part of the kingdom of Arles. The emperor Charles IV. having caused himself to be crowned at Arles in 1365, and created the dauphin of France his viceroy.

Upon Provence, as a member of the kingdom of Arles, for which Charles of Anjou did homage to the empire.

Upon the principality of Orange, as an arriere fief of the empire.

Upon Avignon, for the same reason.

Upon Sardinia, which Frederick II. erected into a kingdom.

Upon Switzerland, as a member of the kingdoms of Arles and Burgundy.

Upon Dalmatia, a great part of which belongs at present wholly to the Venetians, and the rest to Hungary.

PRIDE.

Cicero, in one of his letters, says familiarly to his friend—"Send to me the persons to whom you wish me to give the Gauls." In another, he complains of being fatigued with letters from I know not what princes, who thank him for causing their provinces to be erected into kingdoms; and he adds that he does not even know where these kingdoms are situated.

It is probable that Cicero, who often saw the Roman people, the sovereign people, applaud and obey him, and who was thanked by kings whom he knew not, had some emotions of pride and vanity.

Though the sentiment is not at all consistent in so pitiful an animal as man, yet we can pardon it in a

Digitized by Google

Cicero, a Cæsar, or a Scipio; but when in the extremity of one of our half barbarous provinces, a man who may have bought a small situation, and printed poor verses, takes it into his head to be proud, it is very laughable.*

PRIESTS.

Priests in a state approach nearly to what preceptors are in private families: it is their province to teach, pray, and supply example. They ought to have no authority over the masters of the house; at least until it can be proved that he who gives the wages ought to obey him who receives them. Of all religions the one which most positively excludes the priesthood from civil authority, is that of Jesus. "Give unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's."—"Among you there is neither first nor last."—"My kingdom is not of this world."

The quarrels between the empires and the priesthood, which have bedewed Europe with blood for more than six centuries, have therefore been, on the part of the priests, nothing but rebellion at once against God and man, and a continual sin against the Holy Ghost.

From the time of Calchas, who assassinated the daughter of Agamemnon, unto Gregory XII. and Sixtus V., two bishops who would have deprived Henry IV. of the kingdom of France, sacerdotel power has been injurious to the world.

Prayer is not dominion, nor exhortation despotism. A good priest ought to be a physician to the soul. If Hippocrates had ordered his patients to take hellebore under pain of being hanged, he would have been more insane and barbarous than Phalaris, and would have had little practice. When a priest says—Worship God; be just, indulgent, and compassionate; he is then a good physician; when he says—Believe me, or you shall be burnt, he is an assassin.

The magistrate ought to support and restrain the

* See the article Jesuits.

Digitized by Google

priest in the same manner as the father of a family ensures respect to the preceptor, and prevents him from abusing it. The agreement of church and state is of all systems the most monstrous, for it necessarily implies division, and the existence of two contracting parties. We ought to say the protection given by government to the priesthood or church.

But what is to be said and done in repect to countries in which the priesthood have obtained dominion, as in Salem, where Melchisedech was priest and king; in Japan, where the dairo has been for a long time emperor? I answer, that the successors of Melchisedech and the dairos have been set aside.

The Turks are wise in this; they religiously make a pilgrimage to Mecca; but they will not permit the xerif of Mecca to excommunicate the sultan. Neither will they purchase from Mecca permission not to observe the ramadan, or the liberty of espousing their cousins or their nieces. They are not judged by imans, whom the xerif delegates; nor do they pay the first year's revenue to the xerif. What is to be said of all that? Reader, speak for yourself.

PRIESTS OF THE PAGANS.

Father Navarette, in one of his letters to Don John of Austria, relates the following speech of the dalai-lama to his privy council:—

"My venerable brothers, you and I know very well that I am not immortal; but it is proper that the people should think so. The Tartars of great and little Thibet are people with stiff necks and little information, who require a heavy yoke and gross inventions. Convince them of my immortality, and the glory will reflect on you, and you will procure honours and riches.

"When the time shall come in which the Tartars will be more enlightened, we may then confess that the grand lamas are not now immortal, but that their predecessors were so; and that what is necessary for the erection of a grand edifice, is no longer so when it is established on an immovable foundation.

Digitized by Google

"I hesitated at first to distribute the *agremens* of my water-closet, properly inclosed in crystals ornamented with gilded copper, to the vassals of my empire; but these relics have been received with so much respect, that the usage must be continued, which after all exhibits nothing repugnant to sound morals, and brings much money into our sacred treasury.

"If any impious reasoner should ever endeavour to persuade the people that one end of our sacred person is not so divine as the other,—should they protest against our relics, you will maintain their value and importance to the utmost of your power.

"And if you are finally obliged to give up the sanctity of our nether end, you must take care to preserve in the minds of the reasoners the most profound respect for our understanding, just as in a treaty with the Moguls, we have ceded a poor province, in order to secure our peaceable possession of the remainder.

"So long as our Tartars of great and little Thibet are unable to read and write, they will remain ignorant and devout; you may therefore boldly take their money, intrigue with their wives and their daughters, and threaten them with the anger of the god Fo if they complain.

"When the time of correct reasoning shall arrive, (for it will arrive some day or other), you will then take a totally opposite course, and say directly the contrary of what your predecessors have said, for you ought to change the nature of your curb in proportion as the horses become more difficult to govern. Your exterior must be more grave, your intrigues more mysterious, your secrets better guarded, your sophistry more dazzling, and your policy more refined. You will then be the pilots of a vessel which is leaky on all sides. Have under you subalterns continually employed at the pumps, and as caulkers to stop all the holes. You will navigate with difficulty, but you will still proceed, and be enabled to cast into the fire or the water, as may be most convenient, all those who would examine whether you have properly refitted the vessel.

Digitized by Google

"If among the unbelievers is a prince of Kalkas, a chief of the Calmucks, a prince of Casan, or any other powerful prince, who has unhappily too much wit, take great care not to quarrel with him. Respect him, and continually observe that you hope he will return to the holy path. As to simple citizens, spare them not, and the better men they are, the more you ought to labour to exterminate them; for being men of honour they are the most dangerous of all to you.

"You will exhibit the simplicity of the dove, the prudence of the serpent, and the paw of the lion, according to circumstances."

The dalai-lama had scarcely pronounced these words when the earth trembled; lightnings sparkled in the firmament from one pole to the other; thunders rolled, and a celestial voice was heard to exclaim, "Adore God and not the grand lama."

All the inferior lamas insisted that the voice said, "Adore God and the grand lama;" and they were believed for a long time in the kingdom of Thibet; but they are now believed no longer.

PRIOR, BUTLER, AND SWIFT.

It was not known to France that Prior, who was deputed by queen Anne to adjust the treaty of Utrecht with Louis XIV. was a poet. France has since repaid England in the same coin, for cardinal Dubois sent our Destouches to London, where he passed as little for a poet as Prior in France. Prior was originally an attendant at a tavern kept by his uncle, when the earl of Dorset, a good poet himself and a lover of the bottle, one day surprised him reading Horace; in the same manner as Lord Ailsa found his gardener reading Newton. Ailsa made his gardener a good geometrician,* and Dorset made a very agreeable poet of his vintner

* This geometrician was called Stowe He composed a mediocre work on the Integral Calculus; but one which, for the time in which it was written, exhibited very extensive information.

Digitized by Google

It was Prior who wrote the history of the soul under the title of 'Alma', and it is the most natural which has hitherto been composed on an existence so much felt, and so little known. The soul, according to Alma, resides at first, in the extremities; in the feet and the hands of children, and from thence gradually ascends to the centre of the body at the age of puberty. Its next step is to the heart, in which it engenders sentiments of love and heroism; thence it mounts to the head at a mature age, where it reasons as well as it is able; and in old age it is not known what becomes of it; it is the sap of an aged tree which evaporates, and is not renewed again. This work is probably too long, for all pleasantry should be short; and it might even be as well were the serious short also.

Prior made a small poem on the battle of Hochstet. It is not equal to his Alma; there is however one good apostrophe to Boileau, who is called a satirical flatterer for taking so much pains to sing that Louis did *not* pass the Rhine. Our plenipotentiary finished by paraphrasing, in fifteen hundred verses, the words attributed to Solomon, that "all is vanity." Fifteen thousand verses might be written on this subject; but wo to him who says all which can be said upon it!

At length queen Anne dying, the ministry changed, and the peace adjusted by Prior being altogether unpopular, he had nothing to depend upon except an edition of his works; which were subscribed for by his party: after which he died like a philosopher, which is the usual mode of dying of all respectable Englishmen.

Hudibras.

There is an English poem which it is very difficult to make foreigners understand, entitled Hudibras. It is a very humourous work, although the subject is

---

For the rest, it is almost without example, that men who have begun late to instruct themselves exhibit great talents, although the efforts which they make to exalt themselves beyond their education often evince great sagacity and strength of mind. This observation goes to destroy the exaggerated opinion of Rousseau on negative education.—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

the civil war of the time of Cromwell. A struggle which cost so much blood and so many tears, originated a poem which obliges the most serious reader to smile. An example of this contrast is found in our Satire of Menippus. Certainly the Romans would not have made a burlesque poem on the wars of Pompey and Cæsar, or the proscription of Anthony and Octavius. How then is it that the frightful evils of the League in France, and of the wars between the king and parliament in England, have proved sources of pleasantry? because at bottom there is something ridiculous hid beneath these fatal quarrels. The citizens of Paris, at the head of the faction of Sixteen, mingled impertinence with the miseries of faction. The intrigues of women, of the legates and of the monks, presented a comic aspect, notwithstanding the calamities which they produced. The theological disputes and enthusiasm of the puritans in England, were also very open to raillery; and this fund of the ridiculous, well managed, might pleasantly enough aid in dispersing the tragical horrors which abounded on the surface. If the bull Unigenitus caused the shedding of blood, the little poem "Philotanus" was no less suitable to subject; and it is only to be complained of for not being so gay, so pleasant, and so various as it might have been; and for not fulfilling in the course of the work the promise held out by its commencement.

The poem of Hudibras of which I speak, seems to be a composition of the satire of Menippus and of Don Quixote. It surpasses them in the advantage of verse and also in wit; the former indeed does not come near it; being a very middling production; but notwithstanding his wit, the author of Hudibras is much beneath Don Quixote. Taste, vivacity, the art of narrating and of introducing adventures, with the faculty of never being tedious, go farther than wit; and moreover, Don Quixote is read by all nations, and Hudibras by the English alone.

Butler, the author of this extraordinary poem, was contemporary with Milton, and enjoyed infinitely more temporary popularity than the latter, because his work

Digitized by Google

was humourous, and that of Milton melancholy. Butler turned the enemies of king Charles II. into ridicule, and all the recompense he received was the frequent quotation of his verses by that monarch. The combats of the knight Hudibras were much better known than the battles between the good and bad angels in Paradise Lost; but the court of England treated Butler no better than the celestial court treated Milton; both the one and the other died in want, or very near it.

A man whose imagination was impregnated with a tenth part of the comic spirit, good or bad, which pervades this work, could not but be very pleasant; but he must take care how he translates Hudibras. It is difficult to make foreign readers laugh at pleasantries which are almost forgotten by the nation which has produced them. Dante is little read in Europe, because we are ignorant of so much of his allusion; and it is the same with Hudibras. The greater part of the humour of this poem being expended on the theology and theologians of its own time, a commentary is eternally necessary. Pleasantry requiring explanation ceases to be pleasantry; and a commentator on bon mots is seldom capable of conveying them.

Of Dean Swift.

How is it that in France so little is understood of the works of the ingenious Doctor Swift, who is called the Rabelais of England? He has the honour, like the latter, of being a churchman and an universal joker; but Rabelais was not above his age, and Swift is much above Rabelais.

Our curate of Meudon, in his extravagant and unintelligible book, has exhibited extreme gaiety and equally great impertinence. He has lavished at once erudition, coarseness, and ennui. A good story of two pages is purchased by a volume of absurdities. There are only some persons of an eccentric taste who pique themselves upon understanding and valuing the whole of this work. The rest of the nation laugh at the humour of Rabelais, and despise the work; regarding him only as the first of buffoons. We regret that

Digitized by Google

a man who possessed so much wit, should have made so miserable an use of it. He is a drunken philosopher, who wrote only in the moments of his intoxication.

Dr. Swift is Rabelais sober, and living in good company. He has not indeed the gaiety of the former, but he has all the finesse, sense, discrimination, which is wanted by our curate of Meudon. His verse is in a singular taste, and almost inimitable. He exhibits a fine vein of humour, both in prose and in verse; but in order to understand it, it is necessary to visit his country.

In this country, which appears so extraordinary to other parts of Europe, it has excited little surprise that doctor Swift, dean of a cathedral, should make merry in his Tale of a Tub with Catholicism, Lutheranism, and Calvinism: his own defence is, that he has not meddled with christianity. He pretends to respect the parent while he scourges the children. Certain fastidious persons are of opinion, that his lashes are so long, they have even reached the father.

This famous Tale of a Tub, is the ancient story of the three invisible rings, which a father bequeathed to his three children. These three rings were the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mahometan religions. It is still more an imitation of the history of Mero and Enégu by Fontenelle. Mero is the anagram of Rome. Enégu of Geneva, and they are two sisters who aspire to the succession of the kingdom of their father. Mero reigns the first, and Fontenelle represents her as a sorceress, who plays tricks with bread and effects conjuration with dead bodies. This is precisely the Lord Peter of Swift, who presents a piece of bread to his two brothers, and says to them, "Here is some excellent burgundy, my friends; this partridge is of a delicious flavour." Lord Peter in Swift performs the same part with the Mero of Fontenelle.

Thus almost all is imitation. The idea of the Persian Letters was taken from that of the Turkish Spy. Boyardo imitated Pulci; Ariosto, Boyardo; the most original wits borrow from one another. Cervantes

Digitized by Google

makes a madman of his Don Quixote, but is Orlando anything else? It would be difficult to decide by which of the two knight-errantry is most ridiculed, the grotesque portraiture of Cervantes, or the fertile imagination of Ariosto? Metastasio has borrowed the greater part of his operas from our French tragedies; and many English authors have copied us, and said nothing about it.* It is with books as with the fires in our grates; every body borrows a light from his neighbour to kindle his own, which in its turn is communicated to others, and each partakes of all.

PRIVILEGE—PRIVILEGED CASES.

Custom, which almost always prevails against reason, would have the offences of ecclesiastics and monks against civil orders, which are very frequent, called privileged offences; and those offences common which regard only ecclesiastical discipline, cases that are abandoned to the sacerdotal hierarchy, and with which the civil power does not interfere.

The church having no jurisdiction but that which sovereigns have granted it, and the judges of the church being thus only judges privileged by the sovereign, those cases should be called privileged which it is their province to judge, and those common offences which are punishable by the prince's officers. But the canonists, who are very rarely exact in their expressions, particularly when treating of regal jurisprudence, having regarded a priest called the official, as being of right the sole judge of the clergy, they have entitled that privilege, which in common law belongs to lay tribunals, and the ordinances of the monarch have adopted this expression in France.

To conform himself to this custom, the judge of the

* Especially in our comedy. It is astonishing how great a portion of that which we call genteel comedy, has been borrowed from the French. The School for Scandal is scarcely an exception. As to Murphy, he is a wholesale borrower from Destouches and others; but the Rosciad settles his share of dramatic merit.—T.

Digitized by Google

church takes cognisance only of common crime; in respect to privileged cases he can act only concurrently with the regal judge, who repairs to the episcopal court, where however he is but the assessor of the judge of the church. Both are assisted by their register; each separately, but in one another's presence, takes notes of the course of the proceedings. The official who presides alone interrogates the accused; and if the royal judge has questions to put to him, he must have permission of the ecclesiastical judge to propose them.

This procedure is composed of formalities, and produces delays which should not be admitted in criminal jurisprudence. Judges of the church who have not made a study of laws and formalities are seldom able to conduct criminal proceedings without giving place to appeals, which ruin the accused in expense, make him languish in chains, or retard his punishment if he is guilty.

Besides, the French have no precise law to determine which are privileged cases. A criminal often groans in a dungeon for a whole year, without knowing what tribunal will judge him.

Priests and monks are in the state and subjects of of it. It is very strange, that when they trouble society they are not to be judged, like other citizens, by the officers of the sovereign.

Among the Jews, even the high priest had not the privilege which our laws grant to simple parish priests. Solomon deposed the high priest Abiathar,* without referring him to the synagogue to take his trial. Jesus Christ, accused before a secular and pagan judge, challenged not his jurisdiction. St. Paul, translated to the tribunal of Felix and Festus, declined not their judgment.

The emperor Constantine first granted this privilege to bishops. Honorius and Theodosius the younger extended it to all the clergy, and Justinian confirmed it.

* I. Kings, ii. 26, 27.

Digitized by Google

In digesting the criminal code of 1670, the counsellor of state, Pussort, and the president of Novion, wished to abolish the conjoint proceeding, and to give to royal judges alone the right of judging the clergy accused of privileged cases; but this so reasonable desire was combatted by the first president De Lamoignon, and the advocate-general Talon, and a law which was made to reform our abuses confirmed the most ridiculous of them.

A declaration of the king, of the 26th of April, 1657, forbids the parliament of Paris to continue the proceeding commenced against cardinal Retz, accused of high treason. The same declaration desires that the suits of cardinals, archbishops, and bishops of the kingdom, accused of the crime of high treason, are to be conducted and judged by ecclesiastical judges, as ordered by the canons,

But this declaration, contrary to the customs of the kingdom, has not been registered in any parliament, and would not be followed. Our books relate several sentences which have doomed cardinals, archbishops, and bishops to imprisonment, deposition, confiscation, and other punishments. These punishments were pronounced against the bishop of Nantes, by sentence of the 25th of June, 1455.

Against Jean de la Balue, cardinal and bishop of Angers, by sentence dated the 29th of July, 1469.

Against Jean Hebert, bishop of Constance, in 1480.

Against Louis de Rochechouart, bishop of Nantes, in 1481.

Against Geoffroi de Pompadour, bishop of Perigueux, and George d'Amboise, bishop of Montauban, in 1488.

Against Geoffroi Dintiville, bishop of Auxerre, in 1531.

Against Bernard Lordat, bishop of Pumiers, in 1537.

Against cardinal de Chatillon, bishop of Beauvais, the 19th of March, 1569.

Against Geoffroi de La Martonie, bishop of Amiens, the 9th of July, 1594.

Digitized by Google

Against Gilbert Genebrard, archbishop of Aix, the 26th of January, 1596.

Against William Rose, bishop of Senlis, the 5th of September, 1598.

Against cardinal de Sourdis, archbishop of Bordeaux, the 17th of November, 1615.

The parliament sentenced cardinal de Bouillon to be imprisoned, and seized his property on the 20th of June, 1710.

Cardinal de Mailly, archbishop of Rheims, in 1717, made a law tending to destroy the ecclesiastical peace established by the government. The hangman publicly burned the law by sentence of parliament.

The sieur Languet, bishop of Soissons, having maintained that he could not be judged by the justice of the king even for the crime of high treason, was condemned to pay a fine of ten thousand livres.

In the shameful troubles excited by the refusal of sacraments, the simple presidial of Nantes condemned the bishop of that city to pay a fine of six thousand francs, for having refused the communion to those who demanded it.

In 1764, the archbishop of Auch, of the name of Montillet, was fined, and his command, regarded as a defamatory libel, was burnt by the executioner at Bordeaux.

These examples have been very frequent. The maxim, that ecclesiastics are entirely amenable to the justice of the king, like other citizens, has prevailed throughout the kingdom. There is no express law which commands it; but the opinion of all lawyers, the unanimous cry of the nation, and the good of the state, are in themselves a law.

PROPERTY.

"Liberty and property" is the great national cry of the English. It is certainly better than "St. George and my right," or "St. Denis and Mont-joie;" it is the cry of nature.

Digitized by Google

From Switzerland to China, the peasants are the real occupiers of the land. The right of conquest alone has, in some countries, deprived men of a right so natural.

The general advantage or good of a nation is that of the sovereign, of the magistrate, and of the people, both in peace and war. Is this possession of lands by the peasantry equally conducive to the prosperity of the throne and the people in all periods and circumstances? In order to its being the most beneficial system for the throne, it must be that which produces the most considerable revenue, and the most numerous and powerful army.

We must enquire therefore, whether this principle or plan tends clearly to increase commerce and population. It is certain, that the possessor of an estate will cultivate his own inheritance better than that of another. The spirit of property doubles a man's strength. He labours for himself and his family both with more vigour and pleasure than he would for a master. The slave, who is in the power of another, has but little inclination for marriage: he often shudders even at the thought of producing slaves like himself.* His industry is damped; his soul is brutalised; and his strength is never exercised in its full energy and elasticity. The possessor of property, on the contrary, desires a wife to share his happiness, and children to assist in his labours. His wife and children constitute his wealth. The estate of such a cultivator, under the hands of an active and willing family, may become ten times more productive than it was before. The general commerce will be increased. The treasure of the prince will accumulate. The country will supply more soldiers. It is clear therefore, that the system is beneficial to the prince. Poland would be thrice as populous and wealthy as it is at present, if the peasants were not slaves.

Nor is the system less beneficial to the great landlords.

* It is to be feared that such is not frequently the case; it would be well if it were.—T.

Digitized by Google

If we suppose one of these to possess ten thousand acres of land cultivated by serfs, these ten thousand acres will produce him but a very scanty revenue, which will be frequently absorbed in repairs, and reduced to nothing by the irregularity and severity of the seasons. What will he in fact be, although his estates may be vastly more extensive than we have mentioned, if at the same time they are unproductive? He will be merely the possessor of an immense solitude. He will never be really rich but in proportion as his vassals are so; his prosperity depends on theirs. If this prosperity advances so far as to render the land too populous; if land is wanting to employ the labour of so many industrious hands—as hands in the first instance were wanting to cultivate the land—then the superfluity of necessary labourers will flow off into cities and sea-ports, into manufactories and armies. Population will have produced this decided benefit, and the possession of the lands by the real cultivators, under payment of a rent which enriches the landlords, will have been the cause of this increase of population.

There is another species of property not less beneficial; it is that which is freed from payment of rent altogether, and which is liable only to those general imposts which are levied by the sovereign for the support and benefit of the state. It is this property which has contributed in a particular manner to the wealth of England, of France, and the free cities of Germany. The sovereigns who thus enfranchised the lands which constituted their domains, derived, in the first instance, vast advantage from so doing by the franchises which they disposed of being eagerly purchased at high prices; and they derive from it, even at the present day, a greater advantage still, especially in France and England, by the progress of industry and commerce.

England furnished a grand example to the sixteenth century, by enfranchising the lands possessed by the church and the monks. Nothing could be more odious and nothing more pernicious than the before prevailing practice of men, who had voluntarily bound themselves, v the rules of their order, to a life of humility and

Digitized by Google

poverty, becoming complete masters of the very finest estates in the kingdom, and treating their brethren of mankind as mere useful animals, as no better than beasts to bear their burdens. The state and opulence of this small number of priests degraded human nature; their appropriated and accumulated wealth impoverished the rest of the kingdom. The abuse was destroyed, and England became rich.

In all the rest of Europe, commerce has never flourished; the arts have never attained estimation and honour, and cities have never advanced both in extent and embellishment, except when the serfs of the crown and the church held their lands in property. And it is deserving of attentive remark, that if the church thus lost rights, which in fact never truly belonged to it, the crown gained an extension of its legitimate rights; for the church, whose first obligation and professed principle it is to imitate its great legislator in humility and poverty, was not originally instituted to fatten and aggrandise itself upon the fruit of the labours of mankind; and the sovereign, who is the representative of the state, is bound to manage with economy the produce of that same labour for the good of the state itself, and for the splendour of the throne. In every country where the people labour for the church, the state is poor; but wherever they labour for themselves and the sovereign, the state is rich.

It is in these circumstances that commerce everywhere extends its branches. The mercantile navy becomes a school for the warlike navy. Great commercial companies are formed. The sovereign finds in periods of difficulty and danger resources before unknown. Accordingly, in the Austrian states, in England, and in France, we see the prince easily borrowing from his subjects an hundred times more than he could obtain by force while the people were bent down to the earth in slavery.

All the peasants will not be rich, nor is it necessary that they should be so. The state requires men who possess nothing but strength and good will. Even

Digitized by Google

such however who appear to many as the very outcasts of fortune, will participate in the prosperity of the rest. They will be free to dispose of their labour at the best market, and this freedom will be an effective substitute for property. The assured hope of adequate wages will support their spirits, and they will bring up their families in their own laborious and serviceable occupations with success, and even with gaiety. It is this class, so despised by the great and opulent, that constitutes, be it remembered, the nursery for soldiers. Thus, from kings to shepherds, from the sceptre to the scythe, all is animation and prosperity, and the principle in question gives new force to every exertion.

After having ascertained whether it is beneficial to a state that the cultivators should be proprietors, it remains to be shown how far this principle may be properly carried. It has happened in more kingdoms than one, that the emancipated serf has attained such wealth by his skill and industry as has enabled him to occupy the station of his former masters, who have become reduced and impoverished by their luxury. He has purchased their lands and assumed their titles; the old noblesse have been degraded, and the new have been only envied and despised. Everything has been thrown into confusion. Those nations which have permitted such usurpations have been the sport and scorn of such as have secured themselves against an evil so baneful.

The errors of one government may become a lesson for others. They profit by its wise and salutary institutions; they may avoid the evil it has incurred through those of an opposite tendency.

It is so easy to oppose the restrictions of law to the cupidity and arrogance of upstart proprietors, to fix the extent of lands which wealthy plebeians may be allowed to purchase, to prevent their acquisition of large seignorial property and privileges,* that a firm

* The two last-mentioned restrictions would be decidedly unjust. But should a government be desirous of preventing the too great inequality of riches, and yet not feel itself sufficiently strong or not be sufficiently wise to abolish at once entails and rights of

Digitized by Google

and wise government can never have cause to repent of having enfranchised servitude and enriched indigence. A good is never productive of evil but when it is carried to a culpable excess, in which case it completely ceases to be a good. The examples of other nations supply a warning; and upon this principle it is easy to explain why those communities which have most recently attained civilization and regular government, frequently surpass the masters from whom they drew their lessons.*

PROPHECIES.

SECTION I.

THIS word in its ordinary acceptation signifies prediction of the future. It is in this sense that Jesus said to his disciples—"That all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the scriptures.†"

We shall feel the indispensable necessity of having our minds opened to comprehend the prophecies, if we reflect that the Jews, who were the depositories of them, could never recognise Jesus for the messiah, and that for eighteen centuries our theologians have disputed with them to fix the sense of some which they endeavour to apply to Jesus. Such is that of Jacob: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come.‡" That of Moses: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet like unto me from the nations and from thy brethren; unto him shall ye hearken.§" That of Isaiah:

primogeniture, the privileges in question might be confined to the fiefs possessed by the ancient or titled nobility. This would at least be acting consistently, though upon a vicious principle—that of making distinctions in favour of particular classes of the community.—*French Ed.*

* Happily, the general reasoning in this article is no longer required by France; and it even appears that Prussia has been recently acting in the spirit of it.—T.

† St. Luke, xxiv. 44, 45. ‡ Gen. xlix. 10. § Deut. xviii. 15.

Digitized by Google

"Behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."* That of Daniel: "Seventy weeks have been determined in favour of thy people, &c."† But our object here is not to enter into theological detail.

Let us merely observe what is said in the Acts of the Apostles,‡ that in giving a successor to Judas, and on other occasions, they acted expressly to accomplish prophecies; but the apostles themselves sometimes quote such as are not found in the Jewish writings; such is that alleged by St. Matthew: "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene."§

St. Jude, in his epistle, also quotes a prophecy from the book of Enoch, which is apocryphal, and the author of the imperfect work on St. Matthew, speaking of the star seen in the east by the magi, expresses himself in these terms:—"It is related to me on the evidence of I know not what writing, which is not authentic, but which far from destroying faith encourages it, that there was a nation on the borders of the eastern ocean which possessed a book that bears the name of Seth, in which the star that appeared to the magi is spoken of, and the presents which these magi offered to the son of God. This nation, instructed by the book in question, chose twelve of the most religious persons amongst them, and charged them with the care of observing whenever this star should appear. When any of them died they substituted one of their sons or relations. They were called magi in their tongue, because they served God in silence and with a low voice.

"These magi went every year, after the corn harvest, to a mountain in their country, which they call the Mount of Victory, and which is very agreeable on account of the fountains that water and the trees which cover it. There is also a cistern dug in the rock, and after having there washed and purified themselves, they

* Isaiah vii. 14. † Dan, ix. 24. ‡ iv. 16. & xiii. 47. § ii. 23.

Digitized by Google

offered sacrifices and prayed to God in silence for three days.

"They had not continued this pious practice for many generations, when the happy star descended on their mountain. They saw in it the figure of a little child, on which there appeared that of the cross. It spoke to them and told them to go to Judea. They immediately departed, the star always going before them, and were two days on the road."

This prophecy of the book of Seth resembles that of Zorodascht or Zoroaster, except that the figure seen in his star was that of a young virgin, and Zoroaster says not that there was a cross on her. This prophecy, quoted in the gospel of the Infancy,* is thus related by Abulpharagius :†—"Zoroaster, the master of the magi, instructed the Persians of the future manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and commanded them to offer him presents when he was born. He warned them that in future times a virgin should conceive without the operation of any man, and that when she brought her son into the world, a star should appear which would shine at noon day, in the midst of which they would see the figure of a young virgin. 'You, my children,' adds Zoroaster, 'will see it before all nations. When therefore you see this star appear, go where it will conduct you. Adore this dawning child; offer it presents, for it is the *word* which created heaven.'"

The accomplishment of this prophecy is related in Pliny's natural history;‡ but besides that the appearance of the star should have preceded the birth of Jesus by about forty years, this passage seems very suspicious to scholars, and is not the first or only one which might have been interpolated in favour of christianity. This is the exact account of it:—"There appeared at Rome for seven days a comet so brilliant, that the sight of it could scarcely be supported; in the middle of it a god was perceived under the human form; they took it for the soul of Julius Cæsar who had just died, and adored it in a particular temple."

* Art. 7. † Dinast, p. 82. ‡ Book ii. c. 23.

Digitized by Google

M. Assermany, in his Eastern Library,* also speaks of a book of Solomon, archbishop of Bassora, entitled the Bee, in which there is a chapter on this prediction of Zoroaster. Hornius, who doubted not its authenticity, has pretended that Zoroaster was Balaam, and that very likely, because Origen, in his first book against Celsus, says, that the magi had no doubt of the prophecies of Balaam, of which these words are found in Numbers:—†"There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." But Balaam was no more a Jew than Zoroaster, since he said himself that he came from Aram—from the mountains of the east.‡

Besides, St. Paul speaks expressly to Titus§ of a Cretan prophet, and St. Clement of Alexandria‖ acknowledged that God, wishing to save the Jews, gave them prophets; with the same motive, he ever created the most excellent men of Greece; those who were the most proper to receive his grace, he separated from the vulgar, to be prophets of the Greeks, in order to instruct them in their own tongue. "Has not Plato,"¶ he further says, "in some manner predicted the plan of salvation, when in the second book of his Republic he has imitated this expression of scripture: **"Let us separate ourselves from the just, for he incommodes us;" and he expresses himself in these terms: "The just shall be beaten with rods, his eyes shall be put out, and after suffering all sorts of evils, he shall at last be crucified."

St. Clement might have added, that if Jesus Christ's eyes were not put out, notwithstanding the prophecy, neither were his bones broken, though it is said in a psalm,—††"While they break my bones, my enemies who persecute me overwhelm me with their reproaches." On the contrary, St. John‡‡ says positively, that the soldiers broke the legs of two others who were crucified

* Vol. iii. part i. p. 316.
† Chap. xxiv. 17.
‡ Chap. xxiii. 7.
§ Chap. i. 12.
‖ Stromates, b. vii. p. 638.
¶ Stromates, book v. p. 601.
** Wisdom, ii. 12.
†† Psalms, lxi. 11.
‡‡ Chap xix. 32 to 36.

Digitized by Google

with him, but they broke not those of Jesus, that the scripture might be fulfilled: *"A bone of him shall not be broken."

This scripture quoted by St. John extended to the letter of the pascal lamb which ought to be eaten by the Israelites, but John the Baptist having called Jesus the lamb of God,† not only was the application of it given to him, but it is even pretended that his death was predicted by Confucius. Spizeli quotes the history of China by Martinus, in which it is related, that in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of King-hi, some hunters outside the gates of the town killed a rare animal which the Chinese called kilin, that is to say, the lamb of God. At this news, Confucius struck his breast, sighed profoundly, and exclaimed more than once,—"Kilin, who has said that thou art come?" He added,—"My doctrine draws to an end; it will no longer be of use, since you will appear."

Another prophecy of the same Confucius is also found in his second book, which is applied equally to Jesus, though he is not designated under the name of the lamb of God. This is it: we need not fear but that when the expected holy one shall come, all the honour will be rendered to his virtue which is due to it. His works will be conformable to the laws of heaven and earth.

These contradictory prophecies found in the Jewish books seem to excuse their obstinacy, and give good reason for the embarrassment of our theologians in their controversy with them. Further, those which we are about to relate of other people, prove that the author of Numbers, the apostles and fathers, recognised prophets in all nations. The Arabs‡ also pretend this, who reckon an hundred and eighty thousand prophets from the creation of the world to Mahomet, and believe that each of them was sent to a particular nation.

We shall speak of prophetesses in the article SIBYLS.

---

* Exodus, xii. 46—Numbers, ix. 12. † John, i. 29, 36.
‡ History of the Arabs, ch. xx., by Abraham Echellensis.

Digitized by Google

SECTION II.

Prophets still exist; we had two at the Bicetre in 1723, both calling themselves Elias. They were whipped; which put it out of all doubt.

Before the prophets of Cevennes, who fired off their guns from behind hedges in the name of the Lord in 1704, Holland had the famous Peter Jurieu, who published the Accomplishment of the Prophecies. But that Holland may not be too proud, he was born in France, in a little town called Mer, near Orleans. However, it must be confessed, that it was at Rotterdam alone that God called him to prophesy.

This Jurieu, like many others, saw clearly that the pope was the beast* in the Apocalypse, that he held 'poculum aureum plenum abominationum,' the golden cup full of abominations; that the four first letters of these four Latin words formed the word papa; that consequently his reign was about to finish; that the Jews would re-enter Jerusalem; that they would reign over the whole world during a thousand years; after which would come the anti-christ; finally, Jesus seated on a cloud would judge the quick and the dead.

Jurieu prophesies expressly,† that the time of the great revolution and the entire fall of papistry "will fall justly in the year 1689, which I hold," says he, "to be the time of the apocalyptic vintage, for the two witnesses will revive at this time: after which, France will break with the pope before the end of this century, or at the commencement of the next, and the rest of the anti-christian empire will be everywhere abolished."

The disjunctive particle, 'or,' that sign of doubt, is not in the manner of an adroit man. A prophet should not hesitate; he may be obscure, but he ought to be sure of his fact.

The revolution in papistry not happening in 1689 as Peter Jurieu predicted, he quickly published a new edition, in which he assured the public that it would be in 1690; and, what is more astonishing, this edition

* Vol. i. p. 187. † Vol. ii. p. 133, 134.

Digitized by Google

was immediately followed by another. It would have been very beneficial if Bayle's dictionary had had such a run in the first instance; the works of the latter have however remained, while those of Peter Jurieu are not even to be found by the side of Nostradamus.

All was not left to a single prophet. An English presbyterian, who studied at Utrecht, combatted all which Jurieu said on the seven vials and seven trumpets of the apocalypse, on the reign of a thousand years, the conversion of the Jews, and even on anti-christ. Each supported himself by the authority of Cocceius, Coterus, Drabicius, and Commenius, great preceding prophets, and by the prophetess Christina. The two champions confined themselves to writing: we hoped they would give each other blows, as Zedekiah smacked the face of Micaiah, saying, "Which way went the spirit of the lord from my hand to thy cheek?" or literally, "How has the spirit passed from thee to me?" The public had not this satisfaction, which is a great pity.

SECTION III.

It belongs to the infallible church alone to fix the true sense of prophecies, for the Jews have always maintained with their usual obstinacy, that no prophecy could regard Jesus Christ; and the fathers of the church could not dispute with them with advantage, since, except St. Ephrem, the great Origen, and St. Jerome, there was never any father of the church who knew a word of Hebrew.

It was not until the ninth century that Raban the Moor, afterwards bishop of Mayence, learned the Jewish language. His example was followed by some others, and then they began disputing with the rabbi on the sense of the prophecies.

Raban was astonished at the blasphemies which they uttered against our Saviour; calling him a bastard, impious son of Panther, and saying that it is not permitted them to pray to God without cursing him:*

* Wegensileus in Præmio, p. 53.

Digitized by Google

"Quod nulla oratio posset apud Deum accepta esse nisi in eâ Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum maledicant. Confitentes eum esse impium et filium impii, id est, nescio cujus œthnici quem nominant Panthera, à quo dicunt matrem Domini adulteratam."

These horrible profanations are found in several places in the Talmud, in the books of Nizachon, in the dispute of Rittangel, in those of Jechiel and Nachmanides, entitled the Bulwark of Faith, and above all, in the abominable work of the Toldos Jeschut.

It is particularly in the Bulwark of Faith of the rabbin Isaac, that they interpret all the prophecies which announce Jesus Christ by applying them to other persons.

We are there assured that the Trinity is not alluded to in any Hebrew book, and that there is not found in them the slightest trace of our holy religion. On the contrary, they point out an hundred passages, which according to them assert that the mosaic law should eternally remain.

The famous passage which should confound the Jews and make the christian religion triumph in the opinion of all our great theologians, is that of Isaiah:—"Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know how to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know how to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall whistle for the flies that are in the brooks of Egypt, and for the bees that are in the land of Assyria. In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head and the hair of the genitals, and he will also consume the beard.

"Moreover, the Lord said unto me, take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz. And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zachariah the son of Jeberechiah. And I went in unto the pro-

Digitized by Google

phetess; and she conceived and bare a son; then said the Lord to me, call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz. For before the child shall have knowledge to cry my father and my mother, the riches of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, shall be taken away before the king of Assyria."

The rabbin Isaac affirms, with all the other doctors of his law, that the Hebrew word 'alma' sometimes signifies a virgin and sometimes a married woman; that Ruth is called 'alma' when she was a mother; that even an adultress is sometimes called 'alma;' that nobody is meant here but the wife of the prophet Isaiah; that her son was not called Immanuel, but Maher-shalal-hash-baz; that when this son should eat honey and butter, the two kings who besieged Jerusalem would be driven from the country, &c.

Thus these blind interpreters of their own religion, and their own language, combatted with the church, and obstinately maintained, that this prophecy cannot in any manner regard Jesus Christ.

We have a thousand times refuted their explication in our modern languages. We have employed force, gibbets, racks, and flames; yet they will not give up.

"He has borne our ills, he has sustained our griefs, and we have beheld him afflicted with sores, stricken by God, and afflicted."

However striking this prediction may appear to us, these obstinate Jews say, that it has no relationship to Jesus Christ, and that it can only regard the prophets who were persecuted for the sins of the people.

"And behold my servant shall prosper, shall be honoured, and raised very high."

They say further that the foregoing passage regards not Jesus Christ but David; that this king really did prosper, but that Jesus, whom they deny, did not prosper.

"Behold I will make a new pact with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah."

They say that this passage signifies not, according to the letter and the sense, anything more than—I will renew my covenant with Judah and with Israel. How-

Digitized by Google

ever, this pact has not been renewed; and they cannot make a worse bargain than they have made. No matter, they are obstinate.

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth a ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

They dare to deny that this prophecy applies to Jesus Christ. They say that it is evident that Micah speaks of some native captain of Bethlehem, who shall gain some advantage in the war against the Babylonians: for the moment after he speaks of the history of Babylon, and of the seven captains who elected Darius. And if we demonstrate that he treated of the Messiah, they still will not agree.

The Jews are grossly deceived in Judah, who should be a lion, and who has only been an ass under the Persians, Alexander, the Seleucides, Ptolemies, Romans, Arabs, and Turks.

They know not what is understood by the Shiloh, and by the rod, and the thigh of Judah. The rod has been in Judah but a very short time. They say miserable things; but the abbé Houteville says not much more with his phrases, his neologism, and oratorical eloquence; a writer who always puts words in the place of things, and who proposes very difficult objections merely to reply to them by frothy discourse, or idle words!

All this is therefore labour in vain; and when the French abbé would make a still larger book, when he would add to the five or six thousand volumes, which we have on the subject, we shall only be more fatigued, without advancing a single step.

We are therefore plunged in a chaos which it is impossible for the weakness of the human mind to set in order. Once more we have need of a church which judges without appeal. For in fact, if a Chinese, a Tartar, or an African, reduced to the misfortune of having only good sense, read all these prophecies, it would be impossible for him to apply them to Jesus Christ, the Jews, or to any one else. He would be in astonishment and

Digitized by Google

uncertainty, would conceive nothing, and would not have a single distinct idea. He could not take a step in this abyss without a guide. With this guide he arrives not only at the sanctuary of virtue, but at good canonships, at large commanderies, opulent abbeys, the crosiered and mitred abbots of which are called monseigneur by his monks and peasants, and to bishoprics which give the title of prince. In a word, he enjoys earth, and is sure of possessing heaven.

PROPHETS.

The prophet Jurieu was hissed; the prophets of the Cevennes were hanged or racked; the prophets who went from Languedoc and Dauphine to London were put in the pillory; the anabaptist prophets were condemned to various modes and degrees of punishment; and the prophet Savonarola was baked at Florence. If, in connection with these, we may advert to the case of the genuine Jewish prophets, we shall perceive their destiny to have been no less unfortunate; the greatest prophet among the Jews, St. John the baptist, was beheaded.

Zachariah is stated to have been assassinated; but, happily, this is not absolutely proved. The prophet Jeddo, or Addo, who was sent to Bethel under the injunction neither to eat nor drink, having unfortunately tasted a morsel of bread, was devoured in his turn by a lion; and his bones were found on the highway between the lion and his ass. Jonah was swallowed by a fish. He did not, it is true, remain in the fish's stomach more than three days and three nights; even this however was passing threescore and twelve hours very uncomfortably.

Habakkuk was transported through the air, suspended by the hair of his head, to Babylon; this was not a fatal or permanent calamity certainly; but it must have been an exceedingly incommodious method of travelling. A man could not help suffering a great deal by being suspended by his hair during a journey of three hundred miles. I certainly should have pre-

Digitized by Google

ferred a pair of wings, or the mare Borac, or the Hippogriffe.

Micaiah, the son of Imla, saw the Lord seated on his throne, surrounded by his army of celestial spirits; and the Lord having enquired who could be found to go and deceive king Ahab, a demon volunteered for that purpose, and was accordingly charged with the commission; and Micaiah, on the part of the Lord, gave king Ahab an account of this celestial adventure. He was rewarded for this communication by a tremendous blow on his face from the hand of the prophet Zedekiah, and by being shut up for some days in a dungeon. His punishment might undoubtedly have been more severe; but still, it is unpleasant and painful enough for a man who knows and feels himself divinely inspired to be knocked about in so coarse and vulgar a manner, and confined in a damp and dirty hole of a prison.

It is believed that king Amaziah had the teeth of the prophet Amos pulled out to prevent him from speaking; not that a person without teeth is absolutely incapable of speaking, as we see many toothless old ladies as loquacious and chattering as ever; but a prophecy should be uttered with great distinctness; and a toothless prophet is never listened to with the respect due to his character.

Baruch experienced various persecutions. Ezekiel was stoned by the companions of his slavery. It is not ascertained whether Jeremiah was stoned or sawed asunder.

Isaiah is considered as having been incontestably sawed to death by order of Manasseh, king of Judah.

It cannot be denied, that the occupation of a prophet is exceedingly irksome and dangerous. For one who, like Elijah, sets off on his tour among the planets in a chariot of light, drawn by four white horses, there are an hundred who travel on foot, and are obliged to beg their subsistence from door to door. They may be compared to Homer, who, we are told, was reduced to be a mendicant in the same seven cities which afterwards sharply disputed with each other the honour of

Digitized by Google

g given him birth. His commentators have attri-
l to him an infinity of allegories which he never
thought of; and prophets have frequently had the
honour conferred upon them. I by no means
that there may have existed elsewhere persons
ssed of a knowledge of the future. It is only
site for a man to work up his soul to a high state
citation, according to the doctrine of one of our
hty modern philosophers, who speculates upon
g the earth through to the Antipodes, and
g the sick by covering them all over with pitch-
ter.*

ie Jews possessed this faculty of exalting and ex-
g the soul to such a degree, that they saw every
e event as clearly as possible; only unfortunately,
difficult to decide whether by Jerusalem they
ys mean eternal life; whether Babylon means
lon or Paris; whether, when they speak of a
d dinner, they really mean a fast, and whether
wine means blood, and a red mantle faith, and a
e mantle charity. Indeed, the correct and com-
understanding of the prophets is the most arduous
nment of the human mind.

here is likewise a farther difficulty with respect to
Jewish prophets, which is, that many among them
Samaritan heretics. Hosea was of the tribe of
char, which dwelt in the Samaritan territory, and
ha and Elijah were of the same tribe. But the ob-
on is very easily answered. We well know that
e wind bloweth where it listeth," and that grace
ts on the most dry and barren, as well as on the
t fertile soil.

PROVIDENCE.

WAS at the grate of the convent when sister Fessue
to sister Confite,—"Providence takes a visible care
ne; you know how I love my sparrow; he would
e been dead if I had not said nine ave-marias to

* See the Diatribe of Dr. Akakia.

Digitized by Google

obtain his cure. God has restored my sparrow to life; thanks to the holy virgin."

A metaphysician said to her:—Sister, there is nothing so good as ave-marias, especially when a girl pronounces them in Latin in the suburbs of Paris; but I cannot believe that God has occupied himself so much with your sparrow, pretty as he is; I pray you to believe that he has other matters to attend to. It is necessary for him constantly to superintend the course of sixteen planets and the rising of Saturn, in the centre of which he has placed the sun, which is as large as a million of our globes. He has also thousands and thousands of millions of other suns, planets, and comets to govern. His immutable laws, and his eternal arrangement, produce motion throughout nature: all is bound to his throne by an infinite chain, of which no link can ever be out of place! If certain ave-marias had caused the sparrow of sister Fessue to live an instant longer than it would naturally have lived, it would have violated all the laws imposed from eternity by the Great Being; it would have deranged the universe; a new world, a new God, and a new order of existence would have been rendered unavoidable.

SISTER FESSUE.

What! do you think that God pays so little attention to sister Fessue?

METAPHYSICIAN.

I am sorry to inform you, that like myself you are but an imperceptible link in the great chain; that your organs, those of your sparrow, and my own, are destined to subsist a determinate number of minutes in the suburbs of Paris.

SISTER FESSUE.

If so, I was predestined to say a certain number of ave-marias.

METAPHYSICIAN.

Yes; but they have not obliged the Deity to prolong the life of your sparrow beyond his term. It has been so ordered, that in this convent at a certain hour you should pronounce, like a parrot, certain

Digitized by Google

in a certain language which you do not under-
that this bird, produced like yourself by the
ible action of general laws, having been sick
get better; that you should imagine that you
ired it, and that we should hold together this
sation.

SISTER FESSUE.

this discourse savours of heresy. My confessor,
verend father de Menou, will infer, that you do
lieve in Providence.

METAPHYSICIAN.

lieve in a general Providence, dear sister, which
d down from all eternity the law which governs
ngs, like light from the sun; but I believe not
particular Providence changes the economy of
orld for your sparrow or your cat.

SISTER FESSUE.

suppose my confessor tells you, as he has told
at God changes his intentions every day in favour
devout?

METAPHYSICIAN.

would assert the greatest absurdity that a con-
of girls could possibly utter to a being who
.

SISTER FESSUE.

confessor absurd! Holy Virgin Mary!

METAPHYSICIAN.

o not go so far as that. I only observe that he
t, by an enormously absurd assertion, justify the
principles which he has instilled into you,—possi-
ery adroitly,—in order to govern you.

SISTER FESSUE.

at observation merits reflection. I will think

PURGATORY.

is very singular that the protestant churches
in exclaiming that purgatory was invented by the
ts. It is true that they invented the art of drawing

Digitized by Google

money from the living by praying to God for the dead; but purgatory existed before the monks.

It was pope John XVI. say they, who, towards the middle of the tenth century, instituted the feast of the dead. From that fact however, I only conclude that they were prayed for before; for if they then took measures to pray for all, it is reasonable to believe that they had previously prayed for some of them; in the same way as the feast of All Saints was instituted, because the feast of many of them had been previously celebrated. The difference between the feast of the All Saints and that of the dead, is, that in the first we invoke, and that in the second we are invoked; in the former we commend ourselves to the blessed, and in the second the unblessed commend themselves to us.

The most ignorant writers know, that this feast was first instituted at Cluni, which was then a territory belonging to the German empire. Is it necessary to repeat, "that St. Odilon, abbot of Cluni, was accustomed to deliver many souls from purgatory by his masses and his prayers; and that one day a knight or a monk, returning from the holy land, was cast by a tempest in a small island, where he met with an hermit, who said to him, that in that island existed enormous caverns of fire and flames, in which the wicked were tormented; and that he often heard the devils complain of the abbot Odilon and his monks, who every day delivered some soul or other; for which reason it was necessary to request Odilon to continue his exertions, at once to increase the joy of the saints in heaven and the grief of the demons in hell."

It is thus that father Gerard, the jesuit, relates the affair in his "Flower of the Saints," after father Ribadeneira. Fleury differs a little from this legend, but has substantively preserved it.

This revelation induced St. Odilon to institute in Cluni the feast of the dead, which was then adopted by the church.

Since this time, purgatory has brought much money to those who possess the power of opening the gates.

Digitized by Google

It was by virtue of this power, that English John, that great landlord, surnamed Lackland, by declaring himself the liegeman of pope Innocent III., and placing his kingdom under submission, delivered the souls of his parents, who had been excommunicated:—"Pro mortuo excommunicato, pro quo supplicant consanguinei.'

The Roman chancery had even its regular scale for the absolution of the dead; there were many privileged altars in the fifteenth century, at which every mass performed for six liards delivered a soul from purgatory. Heretics could not ascend beyond the truth, that the apostles had the right of unbinding all who were bound on earth, but not *under* the earth; and many of them, like impious persons, doubted the power of the keys. It is however to be remarked, that when the pope is inclined to remit five or six hundred years of purgatory, he accords the grace with full power:—"Pro potestate à Deo accepta concedit."

Of the Antiquity of Purgatory.

It is pretended, that purgatory was, from time immemorial, known to the famous Jewish people, and it is founded on the second book of the Maccabees, which says expressly, "that being found concealed in the vestments of the Jews (at the battle of Adullam), things consecrated to the idols of Jamma, it was manifest that on that account they had perished; and having made a gathering of twelve thousand drachms* of silver, Judas, who thought religiously of the resurrection, sent them to Jerusalem for the sins of the dead."

Having taken upon ourselves the task of relating the objections of the heretics and infidels, for the purpose of confounding them by their own opinions, we will detail here these objections to the twelve thousand drachms transmitted by Judas; and to purgatory.

They say:—

1. That twelve thousand drachms of silver was too

* Book ii. chap. xii. 40, 43. and seq.

Digitized by Google

much for Judas Maccabeus, who only maintained a petty war of insurgency against a great king.

2. That they might send a present to Jerusalem for the sins of the dead, in order to bring down the blessing of God on the survivors.

3. That the idea of a resurrection was not entertained among the Jews at this time, it being ascertained that this doctrine was not discussed among them until the time of Gamaliel, a little before the ministry of Jesus Christ.*

4. As the laws of the Jews included in the Decalogue, Leviticus and Deuteronomy, have not spoken of the immortality of the soul, nor of the torments of hell, it was impossible that they should contain the doctrine of purgatory.

5. Heretics and infidels make the greatest efforts to demonstrate in their manner, that the books of the Maccabees are evidently apocryphal. The following are their pretended proofs:—

The Jews have never acknowledged the books of the Maccabees to be canonical, why then should we acknowledge them?

Origen declares formally that the books of the Maccabees are to be rejected, and St. Jerome regards them as unworthy of credit.

The council of Laodicia, held in 567, admits them not among the canonical books. The Athanasiuses, the Cyrils, and the Hillaries, have also rejected them.

The reasons for treating the foregoing books as romances, and as very bad romances, are as follow:—

The ignorant author commences by a falsehood, known to be such by all the world. He says:—

"Alexander called the young nobles, who had been educated with him from their infancy, and parted his kingdom among them while he still lived."†

So gross and absurd a lie could not issue from the pen of a sacred and inspired writer.

---

* See Talmud, vol. ii. † Book i. chap. i. 7.

Digitized by Google

The author of the Maccabees, in speaking of Antiochus Epiphanes, says,—

"Antiochus marched towards Elymais, and wished to pillage it, but was not able, because his intention was known to the inhabitants, who assembled in order to give him battle, on which he departed with great sadness, and returned to Babylon. Whilst he was still in Persia, he learned that his army in Judea had fled . . . and he took to his bed and died."*

The same writer himself, in another place, says quite the contrary;† for he relates that Antiochus Epiphanes was about to pillage Persepolis, and not Elymais; that he fell from his chariot; that he was stricken with an incurable wound; that he was devoured by worms; that he demanded pardon of the god of the Jews; that he wished himself to be a Jew: it is there where we find the celebrated versicle, which fanatics have applied so frequently to their enemies;—"Orabet scelestus ille veniam quam non erat consecuturus." The wicked man demandeth a pardon, which he cannot obtain. This passage is very Jewish; but it is not permitted to an inspired writer to contradict himself so flagrantly.

This is not all: behold another contradiction, and another oversight. The author makes Antiochus die in a third manner,‡ so that there is quite a choice. He remarks that this prince was stoned in the temple of Nanneus; and those who would excuse the stupidity pretend that he here speaks of Antiochus Eupator; but neither Epiphanes nor Eupator was stoned.

Moreover, this author§ says, that another Antiochus (the great) was taken by the Romans, and that they gave to Eumenes the Indies and Media. This is about equal to saying that Francis I. made a prisoner of Henry VIII., and that he gave Turkey to the duke of Savoy. It is insulting the Holy Ghost to imagine it capable of dictating so many disgusting absurdities.

* Macc. book i. chap. vi. 2, 3, and seq.
† Book ii. chap. ix.
‡ Book ii. chap. ii. 16.
§ Book i. chap. viii. 7, 8.

Digitized by Google

The same author says,* that the Romans conquered the Galatians; but they did not conquer Galatia for more than an hundred years after. Thus the unhappy story-teller did not write for more than an hundred years after the time in which it was supposed that he wrote; and it is thus, according to the infidels, with almost all the Jewish books.

The same author observes,† that the Romans every year nominated a chief of the senate. Behold a well-informed man, who did not even know that Rome had two consuls! What reliance, say infidels, can be placed in these rhapsodies and puerile tales, strung together without choice or order by the most imbecile of men? How shameful to believe in them! and the barbarity of persecuting sensible men, in order to force a belief of miserable absurdities, for which they could not but entertain the most sovereign contempt, is equal to that of cannibals.

Our answer is, that some mistakes which probably arose from the copyists may not affect the fundamental truths of the remainder; that the Holy Ghost inspired the author only, and not the copyists; that if the council of Laodicea rejected the Maccabees, they have been admitted by the council of Trent; that they are admitted by the Roman church; and consequently that we ought to receive them with due submission.

Of the Origin of Purgatory.

It is certain that those who admitted of purgatory in the primitive church were treated as heretics. The Simonians were condemned who admitted the purgation of souls—Psuken Kadaron.‡

St. Augustin has since condemned the followers of Origen who maintained this doctrine.

But the Simonians and the Origenists had taken their purgatory from Virgil, Plato, and the Egyptians.

You will find it clearly indicated in the sixth book of

---

* Book i. chap. viii. 2, 3. † Ibid, 15, 16.
‡ Book of Heresies, chap. xxii.

Digitized by Google

the Eneid, as we have already remarked. What is still more singular, Virgil describes souls suspended in air, others burned, and others drowned:—

> Aliæ panduntur inanis
> Suspensæ ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
> Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur egeri.
> Eneid, Book vi. 740, 742.

> For this are various penances enjoin'd,
> And some are hung to bleach upon the wind;
> Some plung'd in waters, others purg'd in fires,
> Till all the dregs are drain'd, and all the rust expires.
> DRYDEN.

And what is more singular still, pope Gregory, surnamed the great, not only adopts this doctrine from Virgil, but in his theology introduces many souls who arrive from purgatory after having been hanged or drowned.

Plato has spoken of purgatory in his Phedon, and it is easy to discover, by a perusal of Hermes Trismegistus, that Plato borrowed from the Egyptians all which he had not borrowed from Timæus of Locris.

All this is very recent and of yesterday, in comparison of the ancient Brahmins. The latter, it must be confessed, invented purgatory in the same manner as they invented the revolt and fall of the genii or celestial intelligences.*

It is in their shasta, or shastabad, written three thousand years before the vulgar era, that you, my dear reader, will discover the doctrine of purgatory. The rebel angels, of whom the history was copied among the Jews in the time of the rabbin Gamaliel, were condemned by the Eternal and his Son to a thousand years of purgatory, after which God pardoned and made them men. This we have already said, dear reader, as also that the Brahmins found eternal punishment too severe, as eternity never concludes. The Brahmins thought like the abbé Chaulieu, and called upon the Lord to pardon them, if, impressed with his bounties, they could not be brought to conceive that they would be punished so

* See article BRAHMINS.

Digitized by Google

rigorously for vain pleasures, which passed away like a dream:—

> Pardonne alors, Seigneur, si, plein de tes bontés,
> Je n'ai pu concevoir que mes fragilités,
> Ni tous ces vains plaisirs que passent comme un songe,
> Pussent être l'objet de tes severités;
> Et si j'ai pu penser que tant des cruautés.
> Puniraient un peu trop la douceur d'un mensonge.
> *Epitre sur la Mort, au Marquis de la* Fare.

QUACK, (OR CHARLATAN.)

The abode of physicians is in large towns; there are scarcely any in country places. Great towns contain rich patients; debauchery, excess at the tables, and the passions, cause their maladies. Dumoulin, the physician, who was in as much practice as any of his profession, said when dying that he left two great physicians behind him,—simple diet and soft water.

In 1728, in the time of Law, the most famous of quacks of the first class, another named Villars, confided to some friends, that his uncle, who had lived to the age of nearly an hundred, and who was then killed by an accident, had left him the secret of a water which could easily prolong life to the age of one hundred and fifty, provided sobriety was attended to. When a funeral passed, he affected to shrug up his shoulders in pity: "Had the deceased," he exclaimed, "but drank my water, he would not be where he is." His friends, to whom he generously imparted it, and who attended a little to the regimen prescribed, found themselves well, and cried it up. He then sold it for six francs the bottle, and the sale was prodigious. It was the water of the Seine, impregnated with a small quantity of nitre, and those who took it and confined themselves a little to the regimen, but above all those who were born with a good constitution, in a short time recovered perfect health. He said to others—"It is your own fault if you are not perfectly cured. You have been intemperate and incontinent, correct yourself of these two vices, and you will live an hundred and

Digitized by Google

fifty years at least." Several did so, and the fortune of this good quack augmented with his reputation. The enthusiastic abbé de Pons ranked him much above his namesake marshal Villars. "He caused the death of men," he observed to him, "whereas you make men live."

It being at last discovered that the water of Villars was only river water, people took no more of it, and resorted to other quacks in lieu of him.

It is certain that he did much good, and he can only be accused of selling the Seine water too dear. He advised men to temperance, and so far was superior to the apothecary Arnault, who amused Europe with the farce of his specific against apoplexy, without recommending any virtue.

I knew a physician of London named Brown, who had practised at Barbadoes. He had a sugar-house and negroes, and the latter stole from him a considerable sum. He accordingly assembled his negroes together, and thus addressed them:—"My friends," said he to them, "the great serpent has appeared to me during the night, and has informed me that the thief has at this moment a paroquet's feather at the end of his nose." The criminal instantly applied his hand to his nose. "It is thou who hast robbed me," exclaimed the master; "the great serpent has just informed me so:" and he recovered his money. This quackery is scarcely condemnable, but then it is applicable only to negroes.

The first Scipio Africanus, a very different person from the physician Brown, made his soldiers believe that he was inspired by the gods. This grand charlatanism was in use for a long time. Was Scipio to be blamed for assisting himself by the means of this pretension? He was possibly the man who did most honour to the Roman republic; but why the gods should inspire him has never been explained.

Numa did better: he civilized robbers, and swayed a senate composed of a portion of them which was the most difficult to govern. If he had proposed his laws

Digitized by Google

to the assembled tribes, the assassins of his predecessor would have started a thousand difficulties. He addressed himself to the goddess Egeria, who favoured him with pandects from Jupiter; he was obeyed without a murmur, and reigned happily. His instructions were sound, his charlatanism did good; but if some secret enemy had discovered his knavery, and had said, "Let us exterminate an impostor who prostitutes the names of the gods in order to deceive men," he would have run the risk of being sent to heaven like Romulus.

It is probable that Numa took his measures ably, and that he deceived the Romans for their own benefit, by a policy adapted to the time, the place, and the early manners of the people.

Mahomet was twenty times on the point of failure, but at length succeeded with the Arabs of Medina, who believed him the intimate friend of the angel Gabriel. If any one at present was to announce in Constantinople that he was favoured by the angel Raphael, who is superior to Gabriel in dignity, and that he alone was to be believed, he would be publicly impaled. Quacks ought to know their time.

Was there not a little quackery in Socrates with his familiar demon, and the express declaration of Apollo, that he was the wisest of all men? How can Rollin in his history reason from this oracle? Why not inform youth that it was a pure imposition? Socrates chose his time ill: about an hundred years before he might have governed Athens.

Every chief of a sect in philosophy has been a little of a quack; but the greatest of all have been those who have aspired to govern. Cromwell was the most terrible of all quacks, and appeared precisely at a time in which he could succeed. Under Elizabeth he would have been hanged; under Charles II. laughed at. Fortunately for himself, he came at a time when people were disgusted with kings: his son followed, when they were weary of protectors.

Digitized by Google

Of the Quackery of Sciences and of Literature.

The followers of science have never been able to dispense with quackery. Each would have his opinions prevail; the subtle doctor would eclipse the angelic doctor, and the profound doctor would reign alone. Every one erects his own system of physics, metaphysics, and scholastic theology; and the question is, who will value his merchandise? You have dependants who cry it up, fools who believe you, and protectors on whom to lean.

Can there be greater quackery than the substitution of words for things, or than a wish to make others believe what we do not believe ourselves?

One establishes vortices of subtile matter, branched, globular, and tubular; another, elements of matter which are not matter, and a pre-established harmony which makes the clock of the body sound the hour, when the needle of the clock of the soul is duly pointed. These chimeras found partisans for many years, and when these ideas went out of fashion, new pretenders to inspiration mounted upon the ambulatory stage. They banished the germs of the world, asserted that the sea produced mountains, and that men were formerly fishes.

How much quackery has always pervaded history: either by astonishing the reader with prodigies, tickling the malignity of human nature with satire, or by flattering the families of tyrants with infamous eulogies!

The unhappy class who write in order to live, are quacks of another kind. A poor man who has no trade, and has had the misfortune to have been at college, thinks that he knows how to write, and repairing to a neighbouring bookseller, demands employment. The bookseller knows that most persons keeping houses are desirous of small libraries, and require abridgments and new tables, orders an abridgment of the history of Rapin Thoyras, or of the church; a collection of bon mots from the Menagiana, or a dictionary of great men, in which some obscure pedant is

Digitized by Google

placed by the side of Cicero, and a sonneteer of Italy as near as possible to Virgil.

Another bookseller will order romances or the translation of romances. If you have no invention, he will say to his workman—You can collect adventures from the grand Cyrus, from Gusman d'Alafrache, from the Secret Memoirs of a Man of Quality or of a Woman of Quality; and from the total you will make a volume of four hundred pages.

Another bookseller gives ten years' newspapers and almanacks to a man of genius, and says—You will make an abstract from all that, and in three months bring it me under the name of a faithful History of the Times, by M. le Chevalier ***, Lieutenant de Vaisseau, employed in the office for foreign affairs.

Of this sort of books there are about fifty thousand in Europe, and the labour still goes on like the secret for whitening the skin, blackening the hair, and mixing up the universal remedy.

QUAKERS.

SECTION I.

*Of the Religion of the Quakers.**

I HAVE thought that the doctrine and history of a people so extraordinary as the quakers merited the curiosity of a reasonable man. To instruct myself in it, I went to find one of the most celebrated quakers of England, who after having been thirty years engaged in commerce, knowing when to set bounds to his fortune and desires, had retired to a village near London. I went to seek him in his retreat; it was a small but well-built house, ornamented with neatness alone. The quaker† was a vigorous old man, who had never

* This article and most of those which treat of English philosophy and literature, appeared about the year 1727, when the author returned from England. It is well known that these works then made much noise under the title of "Lettres Philosophiques."—*French Ed.*

† His name was Andrew Pitt, and all this, with the exception of a few slight circumstances, is exactly true. Andrew Pitt after-

Digitized by Google

known ill health because he had never indulged his passions nor practised intemperance. I never in my life saw a more noble or engaging air than his. He was dressed like all of his religion, in a coat without plaits in the sides, or buttons on the pockets and wrists, and wore a large hat with a broad brim like our ecclesiastics. He received me with his hat on his head, and advanced towards me without making the least inclination of his body; but he had more politeness in the open and humane expression of his countenance, than there is in the custom of drawing one leg after the other, and carrying in the hand that which is made to cover the head. "Friend," said he to me, "I see that thou art a stranger; if I can be of any service to thee, thou hast only to speak." "Sir," said I, bending my body and sliding my foot towards him according to our custom, "I flatter myself that my just curiosity will not displease you, and that you will do me the honour to instruct me in your religion." "The people of thy country," answered he, "make too many compliments and reverences; but I have never yet seen any of them who had the same curiosity. Come in and let us first dine together." I made some more bad compliments, because I could not suddenly divest myself of my general habits; and after a wholesome and frugal repast, which was commenced and finished by a prayer to God, I began to interrogate my host.

I opened the subject by the question which good catholics have more than once put to huguenots:—"My dear sir," said I, "are you baptised?" "No," answered the quaker, "nor are my brethren." "Morbleu!" replied I, "you are not then christians?" "Friend," rejoined he, "swear not at all: we are christians; but we think not that christianity consists in throwing water on the head of a child with a little salt in it." "Oh, good God!" cried I, amazed at this impiety, "have you then forgotten that Jesus Christ was baptised by John?" "Once more, friend,

wards wrote to the author to complain that he had added a little to the truth, and assured him that God was offended at his sporting with the quakers.—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

no oaths," said the benign quaker: "Christ received the baptism of John, but he never baptised any one; we are not the disciples of John but of Christ." "Ah, you would be burnt immediately by the holy inquisition," exclaimed I; "in the name of God, my dear man, let me baptise you." "If that only was wanting, in condescension to thy weakness we would do it willingly," added he gravely; "we condemn no one for using the ceremony of baptism, but we think that those professing a gentle, holy, and spiritual religion, should abstain as much as they can from judaical ceremonies."

"Judaical ceremonies!" cried I. "Yes, friend," continued he, "and so judaical, that several Jews still sometimes make use of the baptism of John. Consult antiquity, it will teach thee that John merely renewed this practice, which was in use a long time before him among the Hebrews, as the pilgrimage of Mecca was among the Ishmaelites. Jesus received the baptism of John in like manner; he also submitted to circumcision; but circumcision and washing with water should both be abolished by the baptism of Christ, that baptism of spirit, that ablution of souls which saves men. So the precursor John said—'I indeed baptise you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' The great apostle of the Gentiles, Paul, also writes to the Corinthians,—'Christ has not sent me to baptise, but to preach the gospel.' So this same Paul baptised but two persons with water, and that was against his inclination. He circumcised his disciple Timotheus; the other apostles circumcised all who wished it. Art thou circumcised?" added he. I replied that I had not that honour. "Well, friend," said he, "thou art a christian without being circumcised, and I without being baptised."

This is the manner in which my good host misapplied, speciously enough, two or three passages of the holy scriptures which seemed to favour his sect; he forgot, with the best grace in the world, an hundred passages

Digitized by Google

which quashed it. I took great care to contest nothing with him; there is nothing to be gained from an enthusiast. It is not advisable to tell a man of the faults of his mistress, nor a pleader of the weakness of his cause, nor to give reasons to a fanatic. Thus I passed on to other questions.

"With regard to the communion," said I, "how do you use it?"—"We use it not," said he. "What! no communion?"—"No; no other than that of hearts." Then he again quoted the scriptures, made me a fine sermon against communion, and spoke with an inspired tone to prove to me that sacraments were all of human invention, and that the word sacrament is not once found in the gospel. "Pardon my ignorance," said he; "I have not brought forward an hundredth part of the proofs of my religion, but thou mayest see them in the exposition of our faith by Robert Barclay. It is one of the best books which ever passed through the hands of men; our enemies agree that it is very dangerous; which proves how reasonable it is." I promised to read this book, and my quaker believed me already converted.

He afterwards, in a few words, gave me the reason of some singularities which expose this sect to the derision of others. "Confess," said he, "that thou hast had much ado to prevent thyself from laughing, when I have answered all thy civilities with my hat on my head, and by 'thouing' thee. Yet thou appearest to me too well-informed to be ignorant, that in the time of Christ no nation fell into the ridiculous custom of substituting the plural for the singular: they said to Cæsar Augustus,—I laud thee, I pray thee, I thank thee; it was not even permitted to say sir, dominus. It was not until a long time after him, that men began to make use of you instead of thou, as if they were double; and to usurp the impertinent titles of highness, eminence, holiness, and even divinity, which some earthly reptiles give to other earthly reptiles, assuring them that, with a profound respect and infamous falsity, they are their very humble and obedient servants. It is to be more on our guard against this unworthy com-

Digitized by Google

merce of lies and flattery, that we equally 'thou' kings and coal-heavers; that we salute no person; having only charity for men and respect for the laws.

"We also wear rather a different dress from other men, in order that it may be a continual warning to us not to resemble them. Others wear marks of their dignities, and we those of christian humility. We fly assemblies of pleasure, spectacles, and play; for we should be much to blame to fill with these trifles hearts in which God should dwell. We never make sermons, not even on justice; we think that the name of the Most High should not be prostituted in the miserable debates of men. When we are obliged to appear before magistrates in the affairs of others (for we never have any law-suits), we affirm the truth by a yes or a no, and the judges believe us on our simple word, whilst so many other christians perjure themselves on the gospel. We never go to war; not that we fear death; on the contrary, we bless the moment which unites us to the Being of beings; but it is that we are neither wolves, tigers, nor bull dogs, but men and christians. Our God, who has commanded us to love our enemies, and to suffer without murmuring, would no doubt be displeased at our crossing the sea to go and kill our fellow-creatures, because murderers, dressed in red, with hats two feet high, enlist citizens by making a noise with two little sticks on the outstretched skin of an ass. And when, after battles gained, all London shines with illuminations, the sky blazes with rockets, and the air resounds with the noise of bells and cannons, we tremble with silence at the murders which cause this public joy."

Such was pretty nearly the conversation which I had with this singular man; but I was much surprised when, on the following sunday, he took me to the quaker's church. They have several chapels in London; that to which I went is near the famous pillar called the Monument. They were already assembled when I entered with my conductor. There were about four hundred men in the church, and three hundred women. The women hid their faces; the men were covered with

Digitized by Google

their large hats; all were seated in profound silence. I passed through the midst of them without a single one raising his eyes to look at me. This silence lasted for a quarter an hour; at last one of them rose, took off his hat, and, after some sighs, uttered, half with his mouth and half through his nose, a piece of balderdash, drawn as he believed from the gospel, but of which neither himself nor any one else understood anything. When this maker of contortions had finished his fine monologue, the assembly separated, all edified and stupified. I enquired of my host why the wisest amongst them suffered such nonsense?—"We are obliged to tolerate it," said he; "because we cannot know, whether a man who rises to speak is inspired by the spirit, or by folly. In doubt, we listen patiently; we even permit women to speak; two or three of our devotees are often inspired at once, and then we have a great noise in the house of the Lord."—"You have no priest then?" said I. "No, friend," said the quaker; "and we find ourselves the better for it." Then opening a book of his sect, he read these words with emphasis:—'It pleaseth not God that we should dare to order some person to receive the Holy Ghost on sundays to the exclusion of all the other faithful.'—"Thank heaven, we are the only sect upon earth who have no priests. Wouldst thou take from us so happy a distinction? Why should we abandon our child to mercenary nurses when we have milk of our own to give it? These hired persons would soon rule the house, and oppress the mother and child. God has said—You have received freely, give freely. After this command, shall we make a trade of the gospel, sell the Holy Spirit, and make a merchant's shop of an assembly of christians? We give no money to men dressed in black, to assist our poor, bury our dead, and preach to the faithful; these holy employments are too dear to us to give them to others."—"But how," insisted I, "can you discern whether it is the spirit of God which animates your discourse?"—"Whoever," said he, "shall pray to God to enlighten him, and shall announce the evangelical

Digitized by Google

truths which he feels, may be sure that God inspires him." Then he overwhelmed me with quotations from scripture, which demonstrated, according to him, that there is no christianity without an immediate revelation; and he added these remarkable words:—"When thou movest one of thy members, is it thine own strength that stirs it? Doubtless not; for this member has often involuntary movements; it is therefore he who created thy body who moves this body of clay; and the ideas which thy soul receives, is it thou who formest them? Still less so; for they come in spite of thee; it is therefore the creator of thy soul who gives thee thy ideas; but as he has left liberty to thine heart, he gives to thy mind the ideas which thy heart merits; thou seest through God, thou actest, thou thinkest through God. Thou hast therefore only to open thine eyes to this light which enlightens all men, and thou wilt both see the truth and cause it to be seen."—"Ah! this is quite father Malebranche," exclaimed I. "I know thy Malebranche," said he; "he was a little of a quaker, but not sufficiently so."

These are the most important things which I have learned concerning the doctrine of the quakers. In the following section you shall have their history, which you will find still more singular than their doctrine.

SECTION II.

History of the Quakers.

We have already seen that the quakers date from Jesus Christ, who, according to them was the first quaker. Religion, they say, became corrupted immediately after his death, and remained in this corruption for about six hundred years; but there were always some quakers concealed in the world, who took care to preserve the sacred fire, everywhere else extinguished, until finally this doctrine extended itself in England in the year 1642.

It was at the time that three or four sects divided Great Britain by civil wars, undertaken in the name of God, that a man of the name of George Fox, of the county of Leicester, the son of a silk weaver, began to

Digitized by Google

preach in the true apostolic style; that is to say, without knowing how to read or write. He was a young man of twenty-five, of irreproachable manners, and holily mad. He was dressed in leather from head to foot, and went from village to village, exclaiming against war and the clergy. If he had only preached against soldiers, he would have had nothing to fear; but as he attacked the clergy, he was soon put in prison, and carried before a justice of the peace at Derby. Fox presented himself to the judge with his leathern hat on his head. A serjeant gave him a blow on the cheek, saying—"Rascal, dost thou not know that thou shouldst appear bare-headed before the judge?" Fox offered the other cheek, and begged the serjeant to give him the other blow for the love of God. The judge of Derby wishing him to swear before he was interrogated—"Friend," said he to him, "know that I never take the name of God in vain." The judge, angry at being so addressed, and wishing to swear him, sent him to the mad-house at Derby to be whipped. Fox went, praising God, to the mad-house, where they failed not to execute the sentence with rigour. Those who inflicted the punishment of the whip on him were much surprised when he begged them to give him some more blows for the good of his soul. They waited not to be asked again. Fox had his double dose, for which he very cordially thanked them, and began to preach to them. At first they laughed; afterwards they listened to him; and, as enthusiasm is a contagious disease, several were persuaded, and those who had whipped him became his first disciples. Delivered from prison, he went about the country with a dozen proselytes, always preaching against the clergy, and being whipped from time to time. One day, being put into the stocks, he harangued all the people with such force, that he converted about fifty, and drew the rest so into his interest, that they released him in triumph from the hole in which he was shackled, and put the vicar, whose credit had condemned Fox to this punishment, in his place.

Digitized by Google

He dared to convert some of Cromwell's soldiers, who renounced the trade of war and refused to take oaths. Cromwell would not have a sect who did not fight, as Sixtus V. augured ill of a sect 'dove non si chiavava,' and made use of his power to persecute these new comers. The prisons were filled with them, but persecutions served only to make proselytes: they went from their prisons confirmed in their belief, and followed by their gaolers whom they had converted. But what most contributed to extend the sect was, that Fox, believing himself inspired, thought that he should speak in a different manner from other men. He began to tremble, to make contortions, and retain his breath, and respire violently; the priestess of Delphos could not have done it better. In a short time he acquired a great habit of inspiration, and soon afterwards he could scarcely speak otherwise. It was the first gift which he communicated to his disciples, who quickly made all the grimaces of their master, and trembled with all their might at the moment of inspiration. It was from this practice that they acquired the name of quakers, which signifies tremblers. The lower people amused themselves with mimicking them, they trembled, spoke through their noses, had convulsions, and believed they had the Holy Ghost. They wanted some miracles, and they performed them.

The patriarch Fox said publicly to a justice of the peace, in the presence of a large assembly—"Friend, take care of thyself; God will punish thee soon for persecuting the holy." This judge was a drunkard, who was intoxicated every day with bad beer and brandy; he died of apoplexy two days after, at the moment he was going to sign an order to send some quakers to prison. This sudden death was not attributed to the intemperance of the magistrate; every body regarded it as an effect of the predictions of the holy man. This death made more quakers than a thousand sermons and as many convulsions could have done. Cromwell, seeing that their number augmented every day, wished to draw them to his side; he offered them

Digitized by Google

money, but they were incorruptible; and he one day said, that this was the only religion against which he could not prevail with gold.

They were sometimes persecuted under Charles II., not for their religion but for not wishing to pay tithes to the clergy; for 'thouing' the magistrates, and refusing to take the oaths prescribed by the law. Finally, in 1765, Robert Barclay, a Scotchman, presented to the king his Apology of the Quakers, as good a work of the kind as could be written. The epistle dedicatory to Charles II. contained no base flatteries, but bold truths and just counsels.—"Thou hast tasted," says he to Charles at the end of this epistle, "of sweetness and bitterness, of prosperity and of the greatest misfortunes; thou hast been driven from the country in which thou reignest; thou hast felt the weight of oppression; and thou shouldst know how detestable the oppressor is to God and men. If, after so many trials and blessings, thy heart should harden and forget the God who remembered thee in thy misfortunes, thy crime would be greater, and thy condemnation more terrible; therefore, instead of listening to the flatterers of thy court, listen to the voice of conscience, which will never flatter thee.

"I am thy faithful friend and subject,

"ROBERT BARCLAY."

What is still more astonishing, this letter, written to a king by an obscure individual, had its effect, and the persecution ceased.

About this time appeared the illustrious William Penn, who established the sect of quakers in America, and who would have rendered them respectable in Europe, if men could have respected virtue under ridiculous appearances. He was the only son of Sir William Penn, vice-admiral of England, and favourite of the duke of York, afterwards James II.

This William Penn, at the age of fifteen, met with a quaker at Oxford, where he pursued his studies; this quaker persuaded him, and the young man, who was lively and naturally eloquent, and who had a prepossessing physiognomy and manners, soon gained over

Digitized by Google

some of his comrades, and insensibly established a society of young quakers, who assembled round him, so that at the age of sixteen he found himself at the head of a sect. On his return from college to the vice-admiral his father, instead of kneeling before him and asking his blessing, according to the custom of the English, he kept his hat on his head and said to him—"I am very happy, friend, to see thee in good health." The vice-admiral thought his son mad, but soon discovered that he was a quaker. He tried all means which human prudence can employ to engage him to live like other people: the young man only answered his father by exhorting him to become a quaker himself. At last the father desisted, merely desiring him to go and see the king and the duke of York with his hat under his arm, and without 'thouing' them. William replied, that his conscience would not permit it, and that it was better to obey God than men. His father, indignant and in despair, drove him from his house. Young Penn thanked God for what he had already suffered in his cause; he went to preach in the city, and there made many proselytes. The sermons of the minister improved every day, and as he was young, handsome, and well-made, all the ladies of the court and city devoutly ran to hear him. The patriarch, George Fox, came from the remotest part of England to see him at London, on his reputation, and both resolved to make missions into foreign countries; they embarked for Holland, after leaving plenty of labourers to take care of the vineyard of London.

Their labours were successful at Amsterdam; but that which did them most honour, and put their humility the most in danger, was the reception given to them by the princess palatine, Elizabeth, aunt of George I., king of England, a woman illustrious by her wit and knowledge, and to whom Descartes dedicated his romance of Philosophy. She was then retired to the Hague, where she saw the 'friends,' for so the quakers called themselves, in Holland. She had several conferences with them, and if they made not a perfect quakeress of her, they at least confess that she

Digitized by Google

ıot far from the kingdom of heaven. The friends sowed in Germany, but they reaped little there; mode of 'thouing' was not relished in a country e the terms highness and excellency are always in

Penn speedily returned to England on hearing ıe illness of his father; he came to receive his last ı. The vice-admiral was reconciled to him and ·aced him with tenderness, although he was of a rent religion; but William in vain exhorted him .o receive the sacrament, and to die a quaker; and 'ood man as uselessly recommended William to have ɔns on his cuffs and loops to his hat.

'illiam inherited great property, among which he d some debts of the crown for advances made by vice-admiral in maritime expeditions. Nothing less certain then, than money due from the crown. ı was obliged to go and 'thou' Charles II. and ninisters more than once for payment. The govern- t in 1680 gave him, instead of money, the property sovereignty of a province of America, to the south Iaryland. Behold a quaker become a sovereign! departed for his new states, with two vessels filled ı quakers who followed him. The country of nsylvania is so called from the name of Penn; he e founded the town of Philadelphia, which is now · flourishing. He began by making a league with American Indians, his neighbours. This is the ; treaty between these people and the christians, ch was not sworn; and at the same time, the only which has not been broken. The new sovereign also the legislator of Pennsylvania; he instituted ; wise laws, none of which have been changed since time. The first is, not to ill-treat any person on subject of religion, and to regard all who believe God as brothers. Scarcely had he established his ·ernment, when many American merchants came to ple this colony. The natives of the country, in- ıd of flying into the woods, insensibly became inti- te with the pacific quakers. In proportion as they ested other christian conquerors and destroyers of ıerica, they loved these new comers. In a little

Digitized by Google

time these pretended savages, charmed with their new neighbours, came in a crowd to ask William Penn to receive them in the number of his vassals. It was a very new spectacle to see a sovereign whom everybody 'thoued', and who was spoken to hat on head; a government without priests, a people without arms, citizens all nearly equal to the magistracy, and neighbours without jealousy. William Penn might boast of restoring the age of gold, which very likely never existed except in Pennsylvania.

He visited England again, after the death of Charles II. on the affairs of his new country. King James, who had loved his father, had the same affection for the son; and no longer considered him as an obscure sectary, but as a very great man. The king's policy too accorded with his taste. He wished to flatter the quakers by abolishing the laws against the nonconformists, in order that he might introduce the catholic religion in favour of this liberty. All the sects of England saw the snare, and suffered not themselves to fall into it; they were all united against catholicism, their common enemy. Penn however thought that he should not renounce his principles, to favour protestants who hated him against a king who loved him. He had established liberty of conscience in America, he wished not to appear to destroy it in Europe; he therefore remained so faithful to James II. that he was generally accused of being a jesuit. This calumny sensibly afflicted him; he was obliged to justify himself by public writings. However, the unfortunate James II. who, like most of the Stuarts, was a composition of greatness and weakness, and who, like them, did too much and too little, lost his kingdom without a sword being drawn, and without being able to say how it happened. All the English sects received from William III. and his parliament the same liberty which they would not hold from James. The quakers by force of law then began to enjoy all the privileges of which they are now in possession. Penn, after finally seeing his sect established without opposition in the country of his birth, returned to Pennsylvania.

Digitized by Google

His own people and the Americans received him with tears of joy, as a father who came to see his children. All his laws had been religiously observed during his absence, which never happened to any legislator before him. He remained some years at Philadelphia, and parted from them, much against his inclination, to go to London, to solicit new advantages in favour of the commerce of the Pennsylvanians. He saw them no more; but died at London in 1718.

It was in the reign of Charles II. that the quakers obtained the noble privilege of the substitution of their solemn affirmation as an oath. The chancellor, a man of wit, addressed them thus: "My friends, Jupiter once ordered all the beasts of burden to come and be shod. The asses represented that their law did not permit it: Well then, said Jupiter, you shall not be shod, but the first false step you make you shall have an hundred lashes."

I cannot tell what will be the fate of the religion of the quakers in America, but I see that it is decaying every day in London. In all countries, the predominant religion, when it persecutes not, has a tendency to absorb all others. Quakers cannot be members of parliament, or possess any public office, because an oath must be taken and they will not swear; thus they are reduced to the necessity of acquiring money by commerce. Their children enriched by the industry of their parents would possess honours, buttons and ruffles; they are ashamed of being called quakers, and turn protestants to be in the fashion.

SECTION III.

Quaker, primitive, member of the primitive christian church, Pennsylvanian or Philadelphian.

Of all these titles, the one which I like best is that of Philadelphian. There are many kinds of vanities, but the finest is that which, not arrogating to itself any title, renders almost all others ridiculous.

I soon accustom myself to see a good Philadelphian treat me as a friend and brother: these words reanimate charity in my heart, which freezes too easily.

Digitized by Google

But that two monks should call and write themselves 'your reverence', that they should cause their hands to be kissed in Italy and Spain, is the greatest degree of insane pride; the greatest degree of folly in those who kiss, and ought to excite the greatest degree of surprize and laughter in those who are witnesses to their fooleries. The simplicity of the Philadelphians is the continual satire of bishops, who *my lord* themselves. "Are you not ashamed to call yourself lord and prince?" said a laic to the son of a machanic become a bishop; "Is it thus that Barnabas, Philip, and Jude styled themselves?" "Go to," said the prelate; "if Barnabas, Philip, and Jude, could have done so, they would; the proof of which is, that their successors did so as soon as they could."

Another, who had one day several Gascons at his table, said "I must be monseigneur, since all these gentlemen are marquises. Vanitas vanitatum."

I have already spoken of quakers in the article CHURCH (PRIMITIVE), for which reason I again speak of them. I beg, my dear reader, you will not say that I repeat myself, for if there are two or three pages repeated in this Dictionary, it is not my fault, it is that of the editors. I am ill at Mount Krapak, and cannot see to everything. I have associates who labour like myself in the vineyard of the Lord, who seek to inspire peace and tolerance, horror for fanaticism, persecution, calumny, harshness of manners, and insolent ignorance.

I tell you, without repetition, that I love quakers. Yes, if the sea did not disagree with me, it should be in thy bosom, Oh Pennsylvania! that I would finish the rest of my career; if there be any remaining. Thou art situated in the fortieth degree of latitude, in the softest and most favourable climate; thy houses commodiously built; thy inhabitants industrious; thy manufactures in repute. An eternal peace reigns among thy citizens; crimes are almost unknown; and there is but a single example of a man banished from the country. He deserved it very properly, being an Anglican priest who turning quaker, was unworthy of

Digitized by Google

being so. This poor man was no doubt possessed of the devil, for he dared to preach intolerance; he was called George Keith, and they banished him. I know not where he went; but may all intolerants go with him.

Thus, of three hundred thousand inhabitants who live happily in thee, there are two hundred thousand foreigners. For twelve guineas, you may purchase an hundred acres of very good land, and in these hundred acres you are truly king, for you are free and a citizen; you can do no harm to any one, nor any one to you; you think as you please, and say what you think without being persecuted; you know not the weight of continually redoubled taxes, you fear not the insolence of an importunate subaltern. It is true, that at Mount Krapak we live nearly the same as yourselves; but we owe the tranquillity which we enjoy only to mountains covered with eternal snow, and to frightful precipices which surround our terrestrial paradise. Further, the devil, as in Milton, sometimes leaps these frightful hills and precipices, to infect the flowers of our paradise with his poisonous breath. Satan transformed himself into a toad to deceive two creatures who loved one another. He once came among us in his own shape to bring intolerance. Our innocence has triumphed over all the malice of the devil.*

QUESTION—TORTURE.

I HAVE always taken it for granted, that the question, or torture, was invented by robbers, who having broken into the abode of a miser, and not finding his treasure, tortured him in a thousand ways until he discovered it.

* This article is retained notwithstanding the alterations, both in respect to quakerism and Pennsylvania, which have taken place since the time of Voltaire; because it is peculiarly imbued with his general philosophy and sarcastic archness. What would he say, now that the open and unrestricted toleration and religious freedom which he so much inculcated are diffused over a vast continent, the expanding foundation of what will probably be the greatest empire of the earth?—T.

Digitized by Google

It has often been said, that torture was a means of saving a robust offender, and of destroying a feeble one; that among the Athenians they never applied the question but in crimes against the state, and that the Romans never subjected a Roman citizen to torture, to force from him a confession of his delinquency—

That the abominable tribunal of the inquisition revived this practice, and in consequence, that it ought to be held in horror throughout the earth—

That it is as absurd to inflict torture to acquire the knowledge of a crime, as it was formerly ridiculous to order a duel to decide the guilt of the accused party. In the one case, the offender was often the conqueror; and in the other, the strongly organised criminal was able to endure the torture, which the innocent accused, possessed of less bodily strength, was unable to sustain—

That the duel being called the judgment of God, with equal absurdity, torture has been called the judgment of God also—

That torture is a punishment longer and more grievous than death; and thus an accused person endures, before his crime is proved, a punishment more cruel than that of death. That a thousand fatal mistakes ought to induce legisiators to put an end to this cruel practice—

That this custom is abolished in many countries of Europe; and that fewer great crimes are committed in those countries than in the countries which retain the torture.

It may be asked, after this, why torture has always existed among the French, who are deemed a mild and agreeable people?

The answer will be, that this frightful custom still subsists in France, because it has been established. It will be admitted, that there are many polite and agreeable persons in France, but it will be denied that the French people are humane.*

* It need not be observed, that thanks, to the exertions of our author and the body who acted with him, this odious infliction has ceased in France, as well as in most of the countries of Europe. Enough of it however remains to render this article of value still.

Digitized by Google

If the torture was applied only to the Clements, the Chatels, the Ravaillacs, and the Damiens, few people would complain, as the lives of kings and the safety of the state may be involved;* but when the judges of Abbeville condemn a young officer to the torture, in order to discover what children were in his company singing an old song, or who had passed a procession of capuchins without taking off their hats, I venture to assert, that this horror, perpetrated in peaceable and enlightened times, is worse than the massacre of St. Bartholomew, perpetrated during the darkness of fanaticism.

We have said as much as this before, and we would profoundly impress our conclusions upon all heads and all hearts.

QUETE, (COLLECTION—GATHERING).

NINETY-EIGHT monastic orders belong to the church; sixty-four of which possess revenues, and thirty-four exist by collections, without obligation, it is said, to labour, either corporeally or spiritually, for their subsistence, but simply for amusement; as lords in fee of the whole world, and participating in the sovereignty of God over the universe, they have the right of living at the expense of the public, without doing anything but what they please.

The following passage will be found in a very curious book, entitled "The Good Fortune of Piety," and the reasons given by the author are not a little

---

Notwithstanding the note in relation to Maria Theresa, which follows, an execrable species of torture still exists in Austria, although not that of the rack. See an excellent "Tour in Germany, and some of the provinces of the Austrian Empire, in the years 1820, 21, 22," just published (July, 1824).—T.

* When the empress queen demanded the opinion of the most enlightened lawyers on this subject, those who proposed to abolish torture excepted the single crime of high treason, as the only one to which it ought to be still applicable. On reading this opinion, the empress abolished torture altogether, and thus a sovereign dared to do what a lawyer would not venture to say.—*French Ed.*

Digitized by Google

convincing:—"Since," says he, "that the Cenobite has sacrificed to Jesus Christ the right of possessing temporal wealth, the world has contained nothing which is not at his disposal; and he sees in kingdoms and seignories only that which his liberality has bestowed as fiefs. He thus possesses the whole world as a seignory, enjoying all as the direct lord, because having rendered himself a possession of Jesus Christ by a direct vow, he partakes in a certain manner of the sovereignty of the latter. The monk has even this advantage over the ruler, that he has no need of employing arms to obtain from the people what is due to his calling. He possesses their affections before he partakes of their liberality; and his empire is extended more over their hearts than their property."

It was Francis d'Assisi, who in the year 1209 invented this new manner of living upon alms; but altered in conformity to his rule: The brethren in whom God has bestowed the talent of labouring faithfully in such a way as to avoid idleness, without extinguishing the spirit of prayer, may receive in return that which is necessary for the bodily wants of themselves and their brethren in humility and poverty; but they must not amass money. The brothers must possess nothing that can be termed property; neither house, nor abode, nor any other thing; but regarding themselves as foreigners in this world, they may with confidence demand alms.

Let us remark with the judicious Fleury, that if the founders of the new mendicant orders were not for the greater part canonised, we might be led to suspect that they had been seduced by self-love into a desire of distinguishing themselves by their superior sanctity. Without prejudice however to their holiness, we may certainly attack their strength of understanding; and pope Innocent III. had reasonable cause to demur in giving his approbation to the new institute of St. Francis; and still more the council of the Lateran, held in 1215, to forbid religious novelties, or, in other words, new orders or congregations.

But, as in the thirteenth century, the christian world

Digitized by Google

began to feel the disorders which abounded—the avarice of the clergy—their luxury—and the lazy and voluptuous lives which had been the result of the richly endowed monasteries, it was so struck with the renunciation of temporal wealth, individually or in common, that in a general chapter, held by St. Francis at Assisi, in 1219, there assembled more than five thousand friars minors, who encamped in the open country, and wanted for nothing from the charity of the neighbouring towns and villages. From all parts of the country, ecclesiastics, laymen, nobles, and the common people were beheld, not only repairing to them with the necessaries of life, but anxious to wait upon and serve them in person, with a holy and emulative display of charity and humility.

St. Francis, by his will, expressly forbade his disciples from demanding any privileges from the pope, or to publish any exposition of his order; yet four years after his death, in a chapter assembled in the year 1230, they obtained from pope Gregory a bull, which declared they were absolved from the obligation of attending to the will of their founder, whose order was at the same time explained in many of its articles. Thus the work of our own hands, so much recommended in scripture, and practised by the early monks, became odious, and mendicity, discreditable before, was rendered honourable.

About thirty years after the death of St. Francis, an extreme relaxation in the orders of his foundation was already apparent. We will cite as a proof of this fact the testimony of St. Bonaventure, which cannot be suspected. It is to be found in the letter which he wrote in 1257, being then general of the order, to all the provincials and guardians. This letter appears in his "Opuscules," vol. ii. page 352. He complains of the multitude of things for which they solicit money; of the idleness of many of the brotherhood; of their vagabond life; of the importunity of their solicitations; of the great buildings which they had erected; and lastly, of their avidity in respect to burials and testaments. St. Bonaventure is not the only one who has

Digitized by Google

exclaimed against these abuses, since M. Camus, bishop of Bellay, observes, that the single order of minoritans had undergone twenty-five reforms in eighty years. Let us observe a word or two upon the abuses which so many reforms will not be sufficient to eradicate.

The mendicant friars, under the pretext of charity, meddled in all sorts of public and private business. They penetrated into the secrets of families, and charged themselves with the execution of wills: they even undertook by deputations to negociate peace between towns and rulers. The popes in particular voluntarily intrusted them with commissions, as men without consequence, who worked at a trifling expense, and who were entirely devoted; they even intrusted them sometimes with the levy of St. Peter's pence.

But the most singular fact of all, was their employment in the conduct of the tribunal of the inquisition. That odious institution, it is known, occupies itself with the capture of offenders, imprisonment, torture, condemnation, confiscation, disgraceful punishments, and very often with death by the secular arm. It is doubtless extraordinary to witness a religious brotherhood, making a profession of the most profound humility and of the most rigid poverty, transformed on a sudden into judges; having serjeants, apparatus, and armed familiars, that is to say, guards, and treasure at their command, to render them terrible to all the world.

We advert to the scorn of manual labour, which produces idleness among the mendicant, as among the other religious orders. By the vagabond life with which they were reproached by St. Bonaventure, they were, he said, expensive to their entertainers, and a scandal instead of an edification. Their importunity rendered a rencounter with them as unpleasant as with a band of robbers; such importunity being a kind of violence, which few people knew how to resist in respect to those whose habit and profession exacted respect; and moreover, it was a necessary result of professed mendicity, for after all they must subsist. At first, hunger and other pressing wants led them to

Digitized by Google

conquer the modesty produced by a decent bringing up; and this barrier once overcome, a merit was made of the impudence which rendered one man superior to another in the exaction of alms and of gifts from the credulous faithful.

"The extent and curious taste of your edifices," adds the same saint, "incommode our friends who supply the funds for their erection, and expose us to the evil report of mankind." "These friars," said also Peter Desvignes "who at the birth of their order seemed to tread under foot the pomps of this world, have resumed all which they gave up; and having nothing, possess all; being more wealthy than the wealthy themselves." We know what Dufresny said to Louis XIV. "Sire, I never behold the new Louvre without exclaiming—Superb monument of one of the greatest kings whose names have filled the earth; palace, worthy of our monarchs; you would be complete if you had been given to one of the four mendicant orders, to hold its chapters and lodge its general."

As to their avidity in respect to burials and wills, Matthew Paris has described it in these terms: "They are solicitous to assist at the death of the great, in prejudice of the ordinary pastors. They are greedy of gain, and extort secret wills; they recommended their own order, and exalt it before all others." Sauval also relates, that in 1502, Gilles Dauphin, general of the Cordeliers, in consideration of the favours which his order had received from the parliament of Paris, bestowed upon the presidents, counsellors, and attornies, the privilege of being interred in the habit of the Cordeliers.* The year following, he gratified with a like brevet the provost of the merchants, the bailiffs, and principal municipal officers of the town. This permission is not to be regarded as a mere honorary mark of esteem, if it is true that St. Francis regularly makes a journey into purgatory every year, in order to relieve

* . . . Dying, put on the weeds of Dominic,
Or in Franciscan think to pass disguis'd.
Paradise Lost.—T.

Digitized by Google

the souls of all who die in the habit of his order; a fact of which these religious formally assure us.

The following trait in relation to this subject will not be out of place. L'Etoile, in his Memoirs, dated 1577, relates, that a very fine girl, disguised as a man, was discovered and taken in the convent of the Cordeliers at Paris. She served, among others, friar Jaques Berson, who was called the Child of Paris, and the Cordelier with the handsome hands. These reverend fathers all averred, that they thought this girl was a boy. She got quit upon a whipping, which was a great reflection upon her chastity, after affirming that she was a married woman, and that out of pure devotion she had waited upon ten or twelve of these good brothers, without deeming her honour in any danger. Possibly she expected by this means to deliver herself from a long sojourn in purgatory; but this L'Etoile does not mention.

The same bishop of Bellay, whom we have already cited, pretends, that a single order of mendicants costs thirty millions of gold for the clothing and nourishment of its monks, without counting extraordinaries; so that no catholic prince levies so much from his subjects, as the Cenobite mendicants, existing in his states, exact from the people at large. But what, if we add to this the thirty-three others? It will be discovered, he asserts, that the whole thirty-four draw more from general Christendom, than all the wealth assessed by the sixty-four endowed orders, and all the rest of the clergy. Let us allow that this is asserting much.*

* It is amusing to read, at a time when this religious vagabondism has become the object of almost general contempt, that Dr. Southey, poet laureat, appears anxious to revive it in the body called Wesleyan methodists, whom he would have the church acknowledge and employ in a similar happy religious revival to that produced in the thirteenth century by St. Francis. To this pleasant and feasible scheme, a due study of the past will furnish a considerable objection. In no long time these orders impoverished the regular clergy, and infringed upon their gains and privileges materially; a species of mischief which the establishment will not be altogether disposed to endure, even at the

Digitized by Google

QUISQUIS (OF) RAMUS.

With some Useful Observations upon Persecutors, Calumniators and Makers of Libels.

It is of very little consequence to you, my dear reader, that one of the most violent persecutions exerted in the sixteenth century against Ramus, had for its object the manner in which we ought to pronounce the words 'quisquis' and 'quanquam.'

This grand dispute divided for a long time all the college governors and schoolmasters of the sixteenth century, but it is now quite extinguished, and will never probably revive again.

Would you learn* whether M. Gallandius Torticolis exceeded M. Ramus, his enemy, in the art of oratory? —you may satisfy yourself by consulting Thomas Freigius, 'in Vita Rami;' for Thomas Freigius is an author who may be acceptable to the curious, whatever Banosius may say to the contrary.

But as this Ramus, founder of the mathematical chair in the Royal College of Paris, was a good philosopher, at a time when we could count only two or three—Montaigne, Charron, and de Thou, the historian; as this Ramus was virtuous in an age of crime, amiable in society, and, would they have allowed of it, even a man of wit—that such a man should have been persecuted all his life, and finally assassinated, by professors and scholars of the university; that these miscreants should have drawn the relics of his bloody corpse to the gates of all the colleges,† as a reparation justly due to the glory of Aristotle—that so many horrors should be committed for the edification of pious catholic souls, I must repeat, O Frenchmen! is not a little barbarous.

I shall be told, that since this time things have ma-

---

recommendation of the author of "The Book of the Church." As to the rest, the similarity without the junction is obvious enough; the religious begging and importunity are undeniable; and a very kindred anxiety in respect to last wills and testaments has long been sufficiently obvious.—T.

* Vide Brantome—Hommes Illustres, tom. ii.

† At the massacre of St. Bartholomew.—T.

Digitized by Google

terially changed in Europe; that manners are softened, and that men are no longer persecuted unto death. What, then, have we not had occasion to remark in this dictionary, that the respectable Barnevelt, the leading man in Holland, died upon the scaffold, in consequence of the most foolish and contemptible dispute that ever troubled theological brains?—

That the criminal process against the unhappy Theophile had its source only in four verses of an ode, imputed to him by the jesuits Garasse and Voisin, who in consequence pursued him with fury the most relentless and artifices the most vile, and even burned him in effigy?—

That the other process of La Cadiere was excited by the jealousy of a jacobin against jesuit, only in consequence of a dispute with him on the subject of grace?—

That a miserable literary dispute in a coffee-house was the first origin of the famous process of Jean Baptiste Rousseau, the poet, a quarrel in which an innocent philosopher was on the point of falling beneath the most criminal manœuvres?

Have we not seen the abbé Guyot des Fontaines denounce the poor abbé Pellegrin as the author of a theatrical production, and thereby deprive him of the permission to say mass, his only means of existence?

The fanatical Jurieu, has he not persecuted the philosopher Bayle without ceasing; and when he had succeeded to deprive him of his pension and his place, was he not so infamous as to persecute him still more?

The theologian Lange accused the German philosopher Wolfe, not only of not believing in God, but even of having insinuated in his course of geometry, that people ought not to enrol themselves in the service of the king of Prussia. Was it not in consequence of this pleasant insinuation, that the monarch in question gave the virtuous Wolfe the choice of quitting his states in twenty-four hours or of being hanged? Lastly, did not a jesuitical cabal nearly prove the destruction of Fontenelle?

Digitized by Google

I could cite an hundred examples of the fury of pedantic jealousies; I will boldly maintain to the shame of this contemptible passion, that if all those who have persecuted celebrated men have not treated them as the collegians treated Ramus, it was only because it was not in their power.

It is above all among the 'canaille' of literature, and in the mire of theology, that this passion rages with most violence.*

* * * * * *

Let all those who are tempted to deal in defamation, say to themselves—There is no example of a libel having produced the least benefit to its author; never has either profit or glory accrued in this shameful career. Of all the libels against Louis XIV., not one is at present found in a respectable library. In an hundred bloody combats in war, of which each may have tended to decide the destiny of a state, three or four only are held in long remembrance. Events fall one upon another like the leaves in Autumn, only to disappear altogether, and yet a garretteer would have his miserable libel live for ever in the memory of man! The garretter may reply, that Horace wrote verses against Pantolabus and Nomentanus, and Boileau against Cotin and the abbé Pure. We may reply to the garretteer—These are not libels; and if thou wouldst mortify thy adversaries, imitate Horace and Boileau; but when thou possessest half their good sense and genius, thou wilt certainly not manufacture libels.

RARE.

Rare in physics is opposed to dense, and in morality it is opposed to common.

---

* Voltaire proceeds to furnish some examples; but as they relate to disputes peculiarly local and temporary in relation to persons and subjects become altogether trifling and obscure, they are omitted. Even in Paris such a collection of flies in amber must now be uninteresting; just as the notes of the Dunciad are gradually becoming pointless in London.—T.

Digitized by Google

The last rare is that which excites admiration. We never admire that which is common; we enjoy it.

A virtuoso is preferred to other poor mortals, when he possesses in his cabinet a rare medal which is good for nothing, a rare book which no one has the courage to read, and an old engraving of Albert Durer, badly designed and executed: and he triumphs if he has in his garden a stunted tree brought from America. This virtuoso has no taste; he has merely vanity. He has heard say that the beautiful is rare; but he ought to know that all which is rare is not beautiful.

Excellence is rare in all the works of nature and of art.

Though much evil has been said of women, I maintain that it is more rare to find women perfectly beautiful than passably good.

In the provinces, you will meet with ten thousand women, attached to their household affairs, sober and laborious, nourishing, rearing, and instructing their children; and you can scarcely find one whom you could exhibit at the spectacles of Paris, London, Naples, or in the public gardens, or who can be regarded as a beauty.

The same in works of art—you have ten thousand daubs for one masterpiece.

If everything was beautiful and good, it is clear that we should no longer admire anything; we should possess it; but should we have pleasure in possessing it? that is the great question.

Why have the fine passages of the Cid, of the Horatii, and of Cinna, had such prodigious success? It is, that, in the profound obscurity in which we were plunged, we suddenly saw a new light shine which we expected not; it is, that excellence is the rarest thing in the world.

The groves of Versailles were at that time of unique beauty in the world, as were certain passages of Corneille. St. Peter's of Rome is unique, and people go from the end of the world in extacy to behold it.

But suppose all the churches of Europe equalled St. Peter's at Rome, that all statues were like that of

Digitized by Google

the Venus de Medicis, that all tragedies were as fine as Racine's Iphigenia, all poetic works as well written as the Art Poetique of Boilieau, all comedies as good as Le Tartuffe, and thus with all things,—should we then have pleasure in possessing the same masterpieces become common, which we so much relished when they were rare? I say boldly no; and I therefore believe that the old school is right,—which it is so rarely. 'Ab assuetis non fit passio'—custom makes not liking.

But, my dear reader, would it be the same with works of nature? Should you be disgusted if all the girls were Helens; and you, ladies, if all the boys were Parises? Suppose that all wines were excellent, should you have the less inclination to drink? if partridges, pheasants, and woodcocks were common at all times, would you have less appetite? I still say boldly, no, notwithstanding the school maxim—'custom makes not liking;' and the reason you know is, that all the pleasures which nature gives us are continually renewed wants, necessary enjoyments, and that the pleasures of the arts are not necessary. It is not necessary for man to have groves in which water spouts up an hundred feet from the mouth of a marble figure, or to go from these groves to see a fine tragedy. But the two sexes are always necessary to one another. The table and the bed are necessary. The custom of being alternately upon these two thrones will never disgust us.

When the little savoyards were shown for the first time, the rarity!—the curiosity! was exclaimed, and nothing was really more rare. It was a masterpiece of optics, invented it is said by Kercher; but it was not necessary, and there are no more fortunes to be made in this great art.

In Paris, we should admire a rhinoceros for some years. In a province, if there were ten thousand rhinoceroses, we should run after them only to kill them; but if there were an hundred thousand fine women, we should always run after them to—honour them.

Digitized by Google

RAVAILLAC.

I KNEW in my infancy a canon of Peronne of the age of ninety-two years, who had been educated by one of the most furious burghers of the League—he always used to say, the late M. de Ravaillac. This canon had preserved many curious manuscripts of the apostolic times, although they did little honour to his party. The following is one of them which he bequeathed to my uncle:—

Dialogue of a Page of the Duke of Sully, and of Master Filesac, Doctor of the Sorbonne, one of the two Confessors of Ravaillac.

MASTER FILESAC.

God be thanked, my dear page, Ravaillac has died like a saint. I heard his confession; he repented of his sin, and determined no more to fall into it. He wished to receive the holy sacrament, but it is not the custom here as at Rome; his penitence will serve in lieu of it, and it is certain that he is in paradise.

PAGE.

He in paradise, in the garden of Eden, the monster!

MASTER FILESAC.

Yes, my fine lad, in that garden, or heaven, it is the same thing.

PAGE.

I believe so; but he has taken a bad road to arrive there.

MASTER FILESAC.

You talk like a young huguenot. Learn that what I say to you partakes of faith. He possessed attrition, and attrition joined to the sacrament of confession, infallibly works out the salvation which conducts straightway to paradise, where he is now praying to God for you.

PAGE.

I have no wish that he should address God on my

Digitized by Google

account. Let him go to the devil with his prayers and his attrition.

MASTER FILESAC.

At the bottom, he was a good soul; his zeal led him to commit evil, but it was not with a bad intention. In all his interrogatories, he replied, that he assassinated the king only because he was about to make war on the pope, and that he did so to serve God. His sentiments were very christian-like. He is saved, I tell you; he was bound and I have unbound him.

PAGE.

In good faith, the more I listen to you the more I regard you as a man bound yourself. You excite horror in me.

MASTER FILESAC.

It is because that you are not yet in the right way; but you will be one day. I have always said that you were not far from the kingdom of heaven; but your time is not yet come.

PAGE.

And the time will never come in which I shall be made to believe that you have sent Ravaillac to the kingdom of heaven.

MASTER FILESAC.

As soon as you shall be converted, which I hope will be the case, you will believe as I do; but in the mean time, be assured that you and the duke of Sully, your master, will be damned to all eternity with Judas Iscariot and the wicked rich man Dives, whilst Ravaillac will repose in the bosom of Abraham.

PAGE.

How, scoundrel!

MASTER FILESAC.

No abuse, my little son. It is forbidden to call our brother "Raca" under the penalty of the gehenna or hell fire. Permit me to instruct without enraging you.

PAGE.

Go on; thou appearest to me so "raca," that I will be angry no more.

MASTER FILESAC.

I therefore say to you, that agreeably to faith you

Digitized by Google

will be damned, as unhappily our dear Henry IV. is already, as the Sorbonne always foresaw.

PAGE.

My dear master damned! Listen to the wicked wretch!—A cane, a cane!

MASTER FILESAC.

Be patient, good young man; you promised to listen to me quietly. Is it not true that the great Henry died without confession? Is it not true that he died in the commission of mortal sin, being still amorous of the princess of Condé, and that he had not time to receive the sacrament of repentance, God having allowed him to be stabbed in the left ventricle of the heart, in consequence of which he was instantly suffocated with his own blood? You will absolutely find no good catholic who will not say the same as I do.

PAGE.

Hold thy tongue, master madman; if I thought that thy doctors taught a doctrine so abominable, I would burn them in their lodgings.

MASTER FILESAC.

Once again, be calm; you have promised to be so. His lordship the marquis of Conchini, who is a good catholic, will know how to prevent you from being guilty of the sacrilege of injuring my colleagues.

PAGE.

But conscientiously, master Filesac, does thy party really think in this manner?

MASTER FILESAC.

Be assured of it; it is our catechism.

PAGE.

Listen; for I must confess to thee, that one of thy sorbonnists almost seduced me last year. He induced me to hope for a pension or a benefice. Since the king, he observed, has heard mass in Latin, you who are only a petty gentleman may also attend it without derogation. God takes care of his elect, giving them mitres, crosses, and prodigious sums of money, while you of the reformed doctrine go on foot, and can do nothing but write. I own I was staggered; but after what thou hast just said to me, I would rather a thousand times be a mahometan than of thy creed.

Digitized by Google

The page was wrong. We are not to become mahometans because we are incensed; but we must pardon a feeling young man who loved Henry IV. Master Filesac spoke according to his theology; the page attended to his heart.

REASONABLE, OR RIGHT.

At the time that all France was carried away by the system of Law, and when he was comptroller-general, a man who was always in the right came to him one day and said:—

"Sir, you are the greatest madman, the greatest fool, or the greatest rogue, who has yet appeared among us. It is saying a great deal; but behold how I prove it. You have imagined that we may increase the riches of a state ten-fold by means of paper. But this paper only represents money, which is itself only a representative of genuine riches, the production of the earth and manufacture. It follows therefore that you should have commenced by giving us ten times as much corn, wine, cloth, linen, &c.; this is not enough, they must be certain of sale. Now you make ten times as many notes as we have money and commodities; ergo, you are ten times more insane, stupid, or roguish, than all the comptrollers or superintendants who have preceded you. Behold how rapidly I will prove my major."

Scarcely had he commenced his major than he was conducted to St. Lazarus.

When he came out of St. Lazarus, where he studied much and strengthened his reason, he went to Rome. He demanded a public audience, and that he should not be interrupted in his harangue. He addressed his holiness as follows:—

"Holy father, you are anti-christ; and behold how I will prove it to your holiness. I call him ante-christ or anti-christ, according to the meaning of the word, who does everything contrary to that which Christ commanded. Now Christ was poor, and you are very rich. He payed tribute, and you exact it. He sub-

Digitized by Google

mitted himself to the powers that be, and you have become one of them. He wandered on foot, and you visit Castle Gandolfo in a sumptuous carriage. He ate of all that which people were willing to give him, and you would have us eat fish on Fridays and Saturdays, even when we reside at a distance from the seas and rivers. He forbade Simon Barjonas from using the sword, and you have many swords in your service, &c. &c. In this sense therefore your holiness is antichrist. In every other sense I exceedingly revere you, and request an indulgence 'in articulo mortis.'"

My free speaker was immediately confined in the castle of St. Angelo.

When he came out of the castle of St. Angelo, he proceeded to Venice and demanded an audience of the doge. "Your serenity," he exclaimed, "commits a great extravagance every year in marrying the sea; for in the first place, people marry only once with the same person; secondly, your marriage resembles that of harlequin, which was only half performed, as wanting the consent of one of the parties; thirdly, who has told you that some day or other the other maritime powers will not declare you incapable of consummating your marriage?"

Having thus delivered his mind, he was shut up in the tower of St. Mark.

When he came out of the tower of St. Mark, he proceeded to Constantinople, where he obtained an interview with the mufti, and thus addressed him:—"Your religion contains some good points, such as the adoration of the Supreme Being, and the necessity of being just and charitable; nevertheless, it is a mere hash composed out of judaism and a wearisome heap of stories from Mother Goose. If the archangel Gabriel had brought from some planet the leaves of the Koran to Mahomet, all Arabia would have beheld his descent. Nobody saw him, therefore Mahomet was a bold impostor, who deceived weak and ignorant people."

He had scarcely pronounced these words, before he was impaled; nevertheless, he had been all along in the right.

Digitized by Google

RELICS.

By this name are designated the remains or remaining parts of the body, or clothes, of a person placed after his death by the church in the number of the blessed.

It is clear that Jesus condemned only the hypocrisy of the Jews, in saying,* "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous." Thus, orthodox christians have an equal veneration for the relics and images of saints, and I know not what. Doctor Henry ventures to say, that when bones or other relics are changed into worms, we must not adore these worms; the jesuit Vasquez† decided that the opinion of Henry is absurd and vain, for it signifies not in what manner corruption takes place, "consequently," says he, "we can adore relics as much under the form of worms as under that of ashes."

However this may be, St. Cyril of Alexandria‡ avows, that the origin of relics is pagan; and this is the description given of their worship by Theodoret, who lived in the commencement of the christian era:§ "They run to the temples of martyrs," says this learned bishop, "some to demand the preservation of their health, others the cure of their maladies; and barren women for fruitfulness. After obtaining children, these women ask the preservation of them. Those who undertake voyages, pray the martyrs to accompany and conduct them; and on their return they testify to them their gratitude. They adore them not as gods, but they honour them as divine men; and conjure them to become their intercessors.

"The offerings which are displayed in their temples are public proofs that those who have demanded with faith, have obtained the accomplishment of their vows,

* Matthew, xxiii. 29.
† Book ii. of the Adoration, disp. iii. chap. viii.
‡ Book x. against Julian.
§ Question 51 on Exodus.

Digitized by Google

and the cure of their disorders. Some hang up artificial eyes, others feet, and others hands of gold and silver. These monuments publish the virtue of those who are buried in these tombs, as their influence publishes that the god for whom they suffered is the true God. Thus christians take care to give their children the names of martyrs, that they may be ensured their protection."

Finally, Theodoret adds, that the temples of the gods were demolished, and that the materials served for the construction of the temples of martyrs: "For the Lord," said he to the pagans, "has substituted his dead for your gods; he has shown the vanity of the latter, and transferred to others the honours paid to them." It is of this that the famous sophist of Sardis complains bitterly, in deploring the ruin of the temple of Serapis at Canopus, which was demolished by order of the emperor Theodosius I. in the year 389.

"People," says Eunapius, "who had never heard speak of war, were however very valiant against the stones of this temple; and principally against the rich offerings with which it was filled. These holy places were given to monks, an infamous and useless class of people, who, provided they wear a black and slovenly dress, hold a tyrannical authority over the minds of the people; and instead of the gods whom we acknowledged through the lights of reason, these monks give us heads of criminals, punished for their crimes, to adore, which they have salted in order to preserve them."

The people are superstitious, and it is superstition which enchains them. The miracles forged on the subject of relics, became a loadstone which attracted from all parts riches to the churches. Stupidity and credulity were carried so far, that in the year 386, the same Theodosius was obliged to make a law by which he forbad buried corpses to be transported from one place to another, or the relics of any martyr to be separated and sold.

During the three first ages of christianity, they were contented with celebrating the day of the death of

Digitized by Google

martyrs, which they called their natal day, by assembling in the cemeteries where their bodies lay, to pray for them, as we have remarked in the article MASS. They dreamed not then of a time in which christians would raise temples to them, transport their ashes and bones from one place to another, show them in shrines, and finally make a traffic of them; which excited avarice to fill the world with false relics.

But the third council of Carthage, held in the year 397, having inserted in the scriptures the Apocalypse of St. John, the authenticity of which was till then contested, this passage of chapter 6—"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God," authorised the custom of having relics of martyrs under the altars; and this practice was soon regarded so essential, that St. Ambrose, notwithstanding the wishes of the people, would not consecrate a church where there were none: and in 692 the council of Constantinople, in Trullo, even ordered all the altars to be demolished under which it found no relics.

Another council of Carthage, on the contrary, in the year 401, ordered bishops to build altars which might be seen everywhere, in fields and on high roads, in honour of martyrs; from which were here and there dug pretended relics, on dreams and vain revelations of all sorts of people.

St. Augustin relates, that towards the year 415, Lucian, the priest of a town called Caphargamata, some miles distant from Jerusalem, three times saw in a dream the learned Gamaliel, who declared to him that his body, that of Abibas his son, of St. Stephen, and Nicodemus, were buried in a part of his parish which he pointed out to him. He commanded him, on their part and his own, to leave them no longer neglected in the tomb in which they had been for some ages, but to go and tell John, bishop of Jerusalem, to come and dig them up immediately, if he would prevent the ills with which the world was threatened. Gamaliel added, that this translation must be made in the episcopacy of John, who died about a year after.

Digitized by Google

The order of heaven was, that the body of St. Stephen should be transported to Jerusalem.

Either Lucian did not clearly understand, or he was unfortunate—he dug and found nothing; which obliged the learned Jew to appear to a very simple and innocent monk, and indicate to him more precisely the place where the sacred relics lay. Lucian there found the treasure which he sought, according as God had revealed it unto him. In this tomb there was a stone on which was engraven the word 'cheliel,' which signifies crown in Hebrew, as 'stephanos' does in Greek. On the opening of Stephen's coffin, the earth trembled, a delightful odour issued forth, and a great number of sick were cured. The body of the saint was reduced to ashes, except the bones, which were transported to Jerusalem and placed in the church of Sion. At the same hour there fell a great rain, until which they had had a great drought.

Avitus, a Spanish priest, who was then in the east, translated into Latin this story, which Lucian wrote in Greek. As the Spaniard was the friend of Lucian, he obtained a small portion of the ashes of the saint, some bones full of an oil which was a visible proof of their holiness, surpassing newly-made perfumes, and the most agreeable odours. These relics, brought by Orosius into the island of Minorca in eight days, converted five hundred and forty Jews.

They were afterwards informed by divers visions, that some monks of Egypt had relics of St. Stephen which strangers had brought there. As the monks, not then being priests, had no churches of their own, they took this treasure to transport it to a church which was near Usala. Above the church some persons soon saw a star which seemed to come before the holy martyr. These relics remained not long in this church; the bishop of Usala finding it convenient to enrich his own, transported them, seated on a car, accompanied by a crowd of people, who sang the praises of God attended by a great number of lights and tapers.

Digitized by Google

In this manner the relics were borne to an elevated place in the church, and placed on a throne ornamented with hangings. They were afterwards put on a little bed in a place which was locked up, but to which a little window was left, that cloths might be touched, which cured several disorders. A little dust collected on the shrine suddenly cured one that was paralytic. Flowers which had been presented to the saint, applied to the eyes of a blind man, gave him sight. There were even seven or eight corpses restored to life.

St. Augustin,* who endeavours to justify this worship by distinguishing it from that of adoration, which is due to God alone, is obliged to agree† that he himself knew several christians who adored sepulchres and images. "I know several who drink to great excess on the tombs, and who in giving entertainments to the dead, fell themselves on those who were buried."

Indeed, turning fresh from paganism, and charmed to find deified men in the christian church, though under other names, the people honoured them as much as they had honoured their false gods; and it would be grossly deceiving ourselves, to judge of the ideas and practices of the populace by those of enlightened and philosophic bishops. We know that the sages amongst the pagans made the same distinctions as our holy bishops. "We must," said Hierocles,‡ "acknowledge and serve the gods so as to take great care to distinguish them from the supreme God, who is their author and father. We must not too greatly exalt their dignity. And finally, the worship which we give them should relate to their sole creator, whom you may properly call the God of gods, because he is the master of all, and the most excellent of all." Porphyrius,§ who, like St. Paul,‖ terms the supreme God, the God who is above all things, adds, that we

* Against Faust, book xx. chap. 4.
† Manners of the Church, chap. 39.
‡ On the Lines of Pythagoras, p. 10.
§ On Abstinence, book ii. art. 34.
‖ Epistle to the Romans, ix. 5.

Digitized by Google

must not sacrifice to him anything that is sensible or material, because, being a pure spirit, everything material is impure to him. He can only be worthily honoured by the thoughts and sentiments of a soul which is not tainted with any sinful passion.

In a word, St. Augustin,* in declaring with naïveté that he durst not speak freely on several similar abuses on account of giving opportunity for scandal to pious persons or to pedants, shows that the bishops made use of the same artifice to convert the pagans, as St. Gregory recommended two centuries after to convert England. This pope being consulted by the monk Augustin on some remains of ceremonies, half civil and half pagan, which the newly converted English would not renounce, answered, "We cannot divest hard minds of all their habits at once; we reach not the top of a steep rock by leaping, but by climbing step by step."

The reply of the same pope to Constantine, the daughter of the emperor Tiberius Constantine, and the wife of Maurice, who demanded of him the head of St. Paul, to place in a temple which she had built in honour of this apostle, is no less remarkable. St. Gregory† sent word to the princess that the bodies of saints shone with so many miracles, that they durst not even approach their tombs to pray, without being seized with fear. That his predecessor (Pelagius II.) wishing to remove some silver from the tomb of St. Peter to another place four feet distant, he appeared to him with frightful signs. That he (Gregory) wishing to make some repairs in the monument of St. Paul, as it had sunk a little in front, and he who had the care of the place having had the boldness to raise some bones which touched not the tomb of the apostle, to transport them elsewhere; he appeared to him also in a terrible manner, and he died immediately. That his predecessor, also, wishing to repair the tomb of St. Lawrence, the shroud which encircled the body of the martyr was imprudently discovered; and although the

* City of God, book xxii. chap. 13. † Letter xxx. ind. xii. b. 3.

Digitized by Google

labourers were monks and officers of the church, they all died in the space of ten days, because they had seen the body of the saint. That when the Romans gave relics, they never touched the sacred bodies, but contented themselves with putting some cloths, with which they approached them, in a box. That these cloths have the same virtue as relics, and perform as many miracles. That certain Greeks doubting of this fact, pope Leo took a pair of scissars, and in their presence cutting some of the cloth which had approached the holy bodies, blood came from it. That in the west of Rome, it is a sacrilege to touch the bodies of saints; and that if any one attempts, he may be assured that his crime will not go unpunished. For which reason, the Greeks cannot be persuaded to adopt the custom of transporting relics. That some Greeks daring to disinter some bodies in the night near the church of St. Paul, intending to transport them into their own country, they were discovered, which persuaded them that the relics were false. That the easterns pretending that the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul belonged to them, came to Rome to take them to their own country; but arriving at the catacombs where these bodies repose, when they would have taken them, sudden lightning and terrible thunder dispersed the alarmed multitude, and forced them to renounce their undertaking. That those who suggested to Constantine the demand of the head of St. Paul from him, had no other design than that of making him lose his favour. St. Gregory concludes with these words: "I have that confidence in God, that you will not be deprived of the fruit of your good-will, nor of the virtue of the holy apostles, whom you love with all your heart and with all your mind; and that if you have not their corporeal presence, you will always enjoy their protection."

Yet the ecclesiastical history pretends, that the translation of relics was equally frequent in the east and west; and the author of the notes to this letter further observes, that the same St. Gregory afterwards gave

Digitized by Google

several holy bodies, and that other popes have given so many as six or seven to one individual.

After this, can we be astonished at the favour which relics find in the minds of people and kings? The sermons most commonly preached among the ancient French were composed on the relics of saints. It was thus that the kings Gontran, Sigebert, and Chilperic, divided the states of Clothaire, and agreed to possess Paris in common. They made oath on the relics of St. Polyeuctes, St. Hilary, and St. Martin. Yet Chilperic possessed himself of the place, and merely took the precaution of having a shrine, with a quantity of relics, which he had carried as a safeguard at the head of his troops, in hopes that the protection of these new patrons would shelter him from the punishment due to his perjury. Finally, the catechism of the council of Trent approved of the custom of swearing by relics.

It is further observed, that the kings of France, of the first and second races, kept in their palaces a great number of relics; above all, the cap and mantle of St. Martin; and that they had them carried in their trains and in their armies. These relics were sent from the palaces to the provinces, when an oath of fidelity was made to the king, or any treaty was concluded.

RELIGION.

SECTION I.

The Epicureans, who had no religion, recommended retirement from public affairs, study, and concord. This sect was a society of friends, for friendship was their principal dogma. Atticus, Lucretius, Memmius, and a few other such men, might live very reputably together; this we see in all countries: philosophize as much as you please among yourselves. A set of amateurs may give a concert of refined and scientific music; but let them beware of performing such a concert before the ignorant and brutal vulgar, lest their instruments be broken over their heads. If you have but a village to govern, it *must* have a religion.

Digitized by Google

I speak not here of an error; but of the only good, the only necessary, the only proved, and the second revealed.

Had it been possible for the human mind to have admitted a religion—I will not say at all approaching ours—but not so bad as all the other religions in the world—what would that religion have been?

Would it not have been that, which should propose to us the adoration of the supreme, only, infinite, eternal Being, the former of the world, who gives it motion and life, "cui nec simile, nec secundum?" That which should re-unite us to this Being of beings as the reward of our virtues, and separate us from him as the chastisement of our crimes?

That which should admit very few of the dogmas invented by unreasoning pride; those eternal subjects of disputation; and should teach a pure morality, about which there should never be any dispute?

That which should not make the essence of worship consist in vain ceremonies, as that of spitting into your mouth, or of taking from you one end of your prepuce, or of depriving you of one of your testicles,—seeing that a man may fulfil all the social duties with two testicles and an entire foreskin, and without another's spitting into his mouth?

That of serving one's neighbour for the love of God, instead of persecuting and butchering him in God's name? That which should tolerate all others, and which, meriting thus the goodwill of all, should alone be capable of making mankind a nation of brethren?

That which should have august ceremonies, to strike the vulgar, without having mysteries to disgust the wise and irritate the incredulous?

That which should offer men more encouragements to the social virtues than expiations for social crimes?

That which should ensure to its ministers a revenue large enough for their decent maintenance, but should never allow them to usurp dignities and power that might make them tyrants? That which should establish commodious retreats for sickness and old age, but never for idleness?

Digitized by Google

A great part of this religion is already in the hearts of several princes; and it will prevail when the articles of perpetual peace proposed by the abbé de St. Pierre, shall be signed by all potentates.

SECTION II.

Last night I was meditating; I was absorbed in the contemplation of nature, admiring the immensity, the courses, the relations of those infinite globes, which are above the admiration of the vulgar.

I admired still more the intelligence that presides over this vast machinery. I said to myself—A man must be blind not to be impressed by this spectacle; he must be stupid not to recognise its author; he must be mad not to adore him. What tribute of adoration ought I to render him? Should not this tribute be the same throughout the extent of space, since the same Supreme Power reigns equally in all that extent?

Does not a thinking being, inhabiting a star of the milky way, owe him the same homage as the thinking being on this little globe where we are? Light is the same to the dog-star as to us; morality too must be the same.

If a feeling and thinking being in the dog-star is born of a tender father and mother, who have laboured for his welfare, he owes them as much love and duty as we here owe to our parents. If any one in the milky way sees another lame and indigent, and does not relieve him, though able to do it, he is guilty in the sight of every globe.

The heart has everywhere the same duties; on the steps of the throne of God, if he has a throne, and at the bottom of the great abyss, if there be an abyss.

I was wrapt in these reflections, when one of those genii who fill the spaces between worlds, came down to me. I recognised the same aërial creature that had formerly appeared to me, to inform me that the judgments of God are different from ours, and how much a good action is preferable to controversy.*

He transported me into a desart covered all over

* See DOGMA.

Digitized by Google

with bones piled one upon another; and between these heaps of dead there were avenues of evergreen trees, and at the end of each avenue, a tall man of august aspect gazing with compassion on these sad remains.

Alas! my archangel, said I, whither have you brought me? "To desolation," answered he. And who are those fine old patriarchs whom I see motionless and melancholy at the end of those green avenues, and who seem to weep over this immense multitude of dead? "Poor human creature! thou shalt know," replied the genius; "but first, thou must weep."

He began with the first heap. "These," said he, "are the twenty-three thousand Jews who danced before a calf, together with the twenty-four thousand who were slain while ravishing Midianitish women: the number of the slaughtered for similar offences or mistakes, amounts to nearly three hundred thousand.

"At the following avenues are the bones of christians, butchered by one another on account of metaphysical disputes. They are divided into several piles of four centuries each: it was necessary to separate them; for had they been all together, they would have reached the sky."

What! exclaimed I, have brethren thus treated their brethren? and have I the misfortune to be one of this brotherhood?

"Here," said the spirit, "are the twelve millions of Americans, slain in their own country for not having been baptised." Ah! my God! why were not these frightful skeletons left to whiten in the hemisphere were the bodies were born, and where they were murdered in so many various ways? Why are all these abominable monuments of barbarity and fanaticism assembled here? "For thy instruction."

Since thou art willing to instruct me, said I to the genius, tell me if there be any other people than the christians and the Jews, whom zeal and religion, unhappily turned into fanaticism, have prompted to so many horrible cruelties? "Yes," said he; "the mahometans have been stained by the same inhuman acts, but rarely; and when their victims have cried out

Digitized by Google

'amman!' (mercy!) and have offered them tribute, they have pardoned them.

"As for other nations, not one of them, since the beginning of the world, has ever made a purely religious war. Now, follow me." I followed.

A little beyond these heaps of dead, we found other heaps: these were bags of gold and silver; and each pile had its label: "Substance of the heretics massacred in the eighteenth century, in the seventeenth, in the sixteenth," and so on. "Gold and silver of the slaughtered Americans," &c. &c. and all these piles were surmounted by crosses, mitres, crosiers, and tiaras, enriched with jewels.

What! my genius, was it then to possess these riches, that these carcases were accumulated? "Yes, my son."

I shed tears; and when by my grief I had merited to be taken to the end of the green avenues, he conducted me thither.

"Contemplate," said he, "the heroes of humanity who have been the benefactors of the earth, and who united to banish from the world, as far as they were able, violence and rapine. Question them."

I went up to the first of this band; on his head was a crown, and in his hand a small censer. I humbly asked him his name. "I," said he, "am Numa Pompilius: I succeeded a robber, and had robbers to govern: I taught them virtue and the worship of God; after me they repeatedly forgot both. I forbade any image to be placed in the temples, because the divinity who animates nature cannot be represented. During my reign, the Romans had neither wars nor seditions; and my religion did nothing but good. Every neighbouring people came to honour my funeral, which has happened to me alone . . . . ."

I made my obeisance, and passed on to the second. This was a fine old man, of about an hundred, clad in a white robe; his middle finger was placed on his lip, and with the other hand he was scattering beans behind him. In him I recognised Pythagoras. He assured me, that he had never had a golden thigh, and

Digitized by Google

that he had never been a cock, but that he had governed the Crotonians with as much justice as Numa had governed the Romans about the same time, which justice was the most necessary and the rarest thing in the world. I learned, that the Pythagoreans examined their consciences twice a day. What good people! and how far are we behind them! Yet we, who for thirteen hundred years have been nothing but assassins, assert that these wise men were proud.

To please Pythagoras, I said not a word to him, but went on to Zoroaster, who was engaged in concentrating the celestial fire in the focus of a concave mirror, in the centre of a vestibule with an hundred gates, each one leading to wisdom. On the principal of these gates,* I read these words, which are the abstract of all morality, and cut short all the disputes of the casuists:—

"When thou art in doubt whether an action is good or bad, abstain from it."

Certainly, said I to my genius, the barbarians who immolated all the victims whose bones I have seen, had not read these fine words.

Then we saw Zaleucus, Thales, Anaximander, and all the other sages who had sought truth and practised virtue.

When we came to Socrates, I quickly recognised him by his broken nose.† Well, said I, you then are among the confidants of the Most High! All the inhabitants of Europe, excepting the Turks and the Crim Tartars, who know nothing, pronounce your name with reverence. So much is that great name venerated, so much is it loved, that it has been sought to discover those of your persecutors. Melitus and Anitus are known because of you, as Ravaillac is known because of Henry IV.; but of Anitus I know only the name. I know not precisely who that villain was by whom you were calumniated, and who suc-

* Zoroaster's precepts are called *gates*, and are one hundred in number.

† See Xenophon.

Digitized by Google

ceeded in procuring your condemnation to the hemlock.

"I have never thought of that man since my adventure," answered Socrates; "but now that you put me in mind of him, I pity him much. He was a wicked priest, who secretly carried on a trade in leather, a trafic reputed shameful amongst us. He sent his two children to my school: the other disciples reproached them with their father's being a currier, and they were obliged to quit. The incensed father was unceasing in his endeavours, until he had stirred up against me all the priests and all the sophists. They persuaded the council of the five hundred, that I was an impious man, who did not believe that the Moon, Mercury, and Mars, were deities. I thought indeed, as I do now, that there is but one God, the master of all nature. The judges gave me up to the republic's poisoner, and he shortened my life a few days. I died with tranquility at the age of seventy years, and since then I have led a happy life with all these great men whom you see, and of whom I am the least. . . . ."

After enjoying the conversation of Socrates for some time, I advanced with my guide into a bower, situated above the groves, where all these sages of antiquity seemed to be tasting the sweets of repose.

Here I beheld a man of mild and simple mien, who appeared to me to be about thirty-five years old. He was looking with compassion upon the distant heaps of whitened skeletons through which I had been led to the abode of the sages. I was astonished to find his feet swelled and bloody, his hands in the same state, his side pierced, and his ribs laid bare by flogging. Good God! said I, is it possible that one of the just and wise should be in this state? I have just seen one who was treated in a very odious manner; but there is no comparison between his punishment and yours. Bad priests and bad judges poisoned him. Was it also by priests and judges that you were so cruelly assassinated?

With great affability he answered—"Yes."

Digitized by Google

And who were those monsters?

"They were hypocrites."

Ah! you have said all! By that one word I understand that they would condemn you to the worst of punishments. You then had proved to them, like Socrates, that the moon was not a goddess, and that Mercury was not a god?

"No; those planets were quite out of the question. My countrymen did not even know what a planet was; they were all arrant ignoramusses. Their superstitions were quite different from those of the Greeks."

Then you wished to teach them a new religion?

"Not at all; I simply said to them—'Love God with all your hearts, and your neighbour as yourselves; for that is all.' Judge whether this precept is not as old as the universe; judge whether I brought them a new worship. I constantly told them, that I was come, not to abolish their law, but to fulfil it; I had observed all their rights; I was circumcised as they all were; I was baptised like the most zealous of them; like them I paid the corban; like them I kept the passover; and ate, standing, lamb cooked with lettuce. I and my friends went to pray in their temple; my friends too frequented the temple after my death. In short, I fulfilled all their laws without one exception."

What! Could not these wretches even reproach you with having departed from their laws?

"Certainly not."

Why then did they put you in the state in which I now see you?

"Must I tell you?—They were proud and selfish; they saw that I knew them; they saw that I was making them known to the citizens; they were the strongest; they took away my life; and such as they will always do the same, if they can, to whoever shall have done them too much justice."

But did you say nothing, did you do nothing, that could serve them as a pretext?

"The wicked find a pretext in everything."

Did you not once tell them that you were come to bring, not peace, but the sword?

Digitized by Google

"This was an error of some scribe. I told them that I brought, not the sword, but peace. I never wrote anything: what I said might be miscopied without any ill intent."

You did not then contribute in anything, by your discourses, either badly rendered or badly interpreted, to those frightful masses of bones which I passed on my way to consult you?

"I looked with horror on those who were guilty of all these murders."

And those monuments of power and wealth—of pride and avarice—those treasures, those ornaments, those ensigns of greatness, which, when seeking wisdom, I saw accumulated on the way—do they proceed from you?

"It is impossible; I and mine lived in poverty and lowliness; my greatness was only in virtue."

I was on the point of begging of him to have the goodness just to tell me who he was; but my guide warned me to refrain. He told me that I was not formed for comprehending these sublime mysteries. I conjured him to tell me only in what true religion consisted?

"Have I not told you already?—Love God and your neighbour as yourself."

What! Can we love God, and yet eat meat on a Friday?

"I always ate what was given me; for I was too poor to give a dinner to any one."

Might we love God and be just, and still be prudent enough not to entrust all the adventures of one's life to a person one does not know?

"Such was always my custom."

Might not I, while doing good, be excused from making a pilgrimage to St. James of Compostello?

"I never was in that country."

Should I confine myself in a place of retirement with blockheads?

"For my part, I always made little journeys from town to town."

Must I take part with the Greek or with the Latin church?

Digitized by Google

"When I was in the world, I never made any difference between the Jew and the Samaritan."

Well, if it be so, I take you for my only master.

Then he gave me a nod, which filled me with consolation. The vision disappeared, and I was left with a good conscience.

SECTION III.

Questions on Religion.

FIRST QUESTION.

Warburton, bishop of Glocester, author of one of the most learned works ever written, thus expresses himself (Divine Legation of Moses, vol. i. page 8):—"A religion, a society, which is not founded on the belief of a future state, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence. Judaism is not founded on the belief of a future state; therefore Judaism was supported by an extraordinary Providence."

Many theologians rose up against him; and, as all arguments are retorted, so was his retorted upon himself; he was told—

"Every religion which is not founded on the dogma of the immortality of the soul, and on everlasting rewards and punishments, is necessarily false. Now these dogmas were unknown to the Jews; therefore Judaism, far from being supported by Providence, was, on your own principles, a false and barbarous religion by which Providence was attacked."

This bishop had some other adversaries, who maintained against him that the immortality of the soul was known to the Jews even in the time of Moses; but he proved to them very clearly, that neither the Decalogue, nor Leviticus, nor Deuteronomy, had said one word of such a belief; and that it is ridiculous to strive to distort and corrupt some passages of other books, in order to draw from them a truth which is not announced in the book of the law.

The bishop, having written four volumes to demonstrate that the Jewish law proposed neither pains nor rewards after death, has never been able to answer his adversaries in a very satisfactory manner. They said

Digitized by Google

to him—"Either Moses knew this dogma, and so deceived the Jews by not communicating it, or he did not know it, in which case he did not know enough to found a good religion. Indeed, if the religion had been good, why should it have been abolished? A true religion must be for all times and all places; it must be as the light of the sun, enlightening all nations and generations."

This prelate, enlightened as he is, has found it no easy task to extricate himself from so many difficulties. But what system is free from them?

SECOND QUESTION.

Another man of learning, and a much greater philosopher, who is one of the profoundest metaphysicians of the day,* advances very strong arguments to prove that polytheism was the primitive religion of mankind, and that men began with believing in several gods before their reason was sufficiently enlightened to acknowledge one only Supreme Being.

On the contrary, I venture to believe that in the beginning they acknowledged one only God, and that afterwards human weakness adopted several. My conception of the matter is this:—

It is indubitable, that there were villages before large towns were built, and that all men have been divided into petty commonwealths before they were united in great empires. It is very natural that the people of a village, being terrified by thunder, afflicted at the loss of its harvests, ill-used by the inhabitants of a neighbouring village, feeling every day its own weakness, feeling everywhere an invisible power, should soon have said,—There is some Being above us who does us good and harm.

It seems to me to be impossible, that it should have said,—There are two powers; for why more than one? In all things we begin with the simple; then comes the compound; and after, by superior light, we go back to the simple again. Such is the march of the human mind!

* Hume.

Digitized by Google

But what is this being who is thus invoked at first? Is it the sun? Is it the moon? I do not think so. Let us examine what passes in the minds of children; they are nearly like those of uninformed men. They are struck, neither by the beauty nor by the utility of the luminary which animates nature, nor by the assistance lent us by the moon, nor by the regular variations of her course; they think not of these things; they are too much accustomed to them. We adore, we invoke, we seek to appease, only that which we fear. All children look upon the sky with indifference; but when the thunder growls, they tremble and run to hide themselves. The first men undoubtedly did likewise. It could only be a sect of philosophers who first observed the courses of the planets, made them admired, and caused them to be adored; mere tillers of the ground, without any information, did not know enough of them to embrace so noble an error.

A village then would confine itself to saying,—There is a power which thunders and hails upon us, which makes our children die; let us appease it. But how shall we appease it? We see, that by small presents we have calmed the anger of irritated men; let us then make small presents to this power. It must also receive a name. The first that presents itself is that of 'chief,' 'master,' 'lord.' This power then is styled 'my Lord.' For this reason perhaps it was, that the first Egyptians called their god 'Knef;' the Syrians, 'Adonai;' the neighbouring nations, 'Baal,' or 'Bel,' or 'Melch,' or 'Moloch;' the Scythians, 'Papæus;' all these names signifying 'lord,' 'master.'

Thus was nearly all America found to be divided into a multitude of petty tribes, each having its protecting god. The Mexicans too, and the Peruvians, forming great nations, had only one god—the one adoring Manco Capak, the other the god of war. The Mexicans called their warlike divinity 'Visiliputsli,' as the Hebrews had called their Lord 'Sabaoth.'

It was not from a superior and cultivated reason that every people thus began with acknowledging one only Divinity; had they been philosophers, they would have adored the God of all nature, and not the god of

a village; they would have examined those infinite relations between all things which prove a Being creating and preserving; but they examined nothing—they felt. Such is the progress of our feeble understanding. Each village would feel its weakness and its need of a protector; it would imagine that tutelary and terrible being residing in the neighbouring forest, or on a mountain, or in a cloud. It would imagine only one, because the clan had but one chief in war; it would imagine that one corporeal, because it was impossible to represent it otherwise. It could not believe that the neighbouring tribe had not also its god. Therefore it was, that Jeptha said to the inhabitants of Moab,—"You possess lawfully what your god Chemoth has made you conquer; you should, then, let us enjoy what our god has given us by his victories."

This language, used by one stranger to other strangers, is very remarkable. The Jews and the Moabites had dispossessed the natives of the country; neither had any right but that of force; and the one says to the other,—Your god has protected you in your usurpation; suffer our god to protect us in ours.

Jeremiah and Amos both ask what right the god Melchem had to seize the country of Gad? From these passages it is evident that the ancients attributed to each country a protecting god. We find other traces of this theology in Homer.

It is very natural, that, men's imaginations being heated, and their minds having acquired some confused knowledge, they should soon multiply their gods, and speedily assign protectors to the elements, the seas, the forests, the fountains, and the fields. The more they observed the stars, the more they would be struck with admiration. How indeed should they have adored the divinity of a brook, and not have adored the sun? The first step being taken, the earth would soon be covered with gods, and from the stars men would at last come down to cats and onions.

Reason however will advance towards perfection: time at length found philosophers who saw that neither onions, nor cats, nor even the stars, had arranged the order of nature. All those philosophers—Babylonians,

Persians, Egyptians, Scythians, Greeks, and Romans—admitted a supreme, rewarding, and avenging God.

They did not at first tell it to the people; for whosoever should have spoken ill of onions and cats before priests and old women, would have been stoned; whosoever should have reproached certain of the Egyptians with eating their gods, would himself have been eaten,—as Juvenal relates that an Egyptian was in reality killed and eaten quite raw, in a controversial dispute.

What then did they do? Orpheus and others established mysteries, which the initiated swore by oaths of execration not to reveal,—of which mysteries the principal was the adoration of a supreme God. This great truth made its way through half the world, and the number of the initiated became immense. It is true, that the ancient religion still subsisted; but as it was not contrary to the dogma of the unity of God, it was allowed to subsist. And why should it have been abolished? The Romans acknowledged the "Deus optimus maximus," and the Greeks had their Zeus—their supreme God. All the other divinities were only intermediate beings; heroes and emperors were ranked with the Gods—i. e. with the blessed; but it is certain that Claudius, Octavius, Tiberius, and Caligula, were not regarded as the creators of heaven and earth.

In short, it seems proved that, in the time of Augustus, all who had a religion, acknowledged a superior, eternal God, with several orders of secondary gods, whose worship was called idolatry.

The laws of the Jews never favoured idolatry; for, although they admitted the Malachim, angels and celestial beings of an inferior order, their law did not ordain that they should worship these secondary divinities. They adored the angels, it is true; that is, they prostrated themselves when they saw them; but as this did not often happen, there was no ceremonial nor legal worship established for them. The cherubim of the ark received no homage. It is beyond a doubt, that the Jews, from Alexander's time at least, openly adored

Digitized by Google

one only God, as the innumerable multitude of the initiated secretly adored him in their mysteries.

THIRD QUESTION.

It was at the time when the worship of a Supreme God was universally established among all the wise in Asia, in Europe, and in Africa, that the christian religion took its birth.

Platonism assisted materially the understanding of its dogmas. The 'Logos,' which with Plato meant the 'wisdom,' the reason of the Supreme Being, became with us the 'word,' and a second person of God. Profound metaphysics, above human intelligence, were an inaccessible sanctuary in which religion was enveloped.

It is not necessary here to repeat how Mary was afterwards declared to be the mother of God; how the consubstantiality of the father and the word was established; as also the proceeding of the 'pneuma,' the divine organ of the divine Logos; as also the two natures and two wills resulting from the hypostasis; and lastly, the superior manducation—the soul nourished as well as the body, with the flesh and blood of the God-man, adored and eaten in the form of bread, present to the eyes, sensible to the taste, and yet annihilated. All mysteries have been sublime.

In the second century, devils began to be cast out in the name of Jesus; before, they were cast out in the name of Jehovah or Ihaho; for St. Matthew relates, that the enemies of Jesus having said that he cast out devils in the name of the prince of devils, he answered, "If I cast out devils by Belzebub, by whom do your sons cast them out?"

It is not known at what time the Jews recognised Belzebub, who was a strange god, as the prince of devils; but it is known, for Josephus tells us, that there were at Jerusalem exorcists appointed to cast out devils from the bodies of the possessed; that is, of such as were attacked by singular maladies, which were then in a great part of the world attributed to malific genii.

Digitized by Google

These demons were then cast out by the true pronunciation of Jehovah, which is now lost, and by other ceremonies now forgotten?

This exorcism by Jehovah or by the other names of God, was still in use in the first ages of the church. Origen, disputing against Celsus, says to him—"If, when invoking God, or swearing by him, you call him 'the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,' you will by those words do things, the nature and force of which are such, that the evil spirits submit to those who pronounce them; but if you call him by another name, as 'God of the roaring sea, &c.,' no effect will be produced. The name of 'Israel' rendered in Greek will work nothing; but pronounce it in Hebrew with the other words required, and you will effect the conjuration."

The same Origen has these remarkable words:—"There are names which are powerful from their own nature. Such are those used by the sages of Egypt, the magi of Persia, and the brahmins of India. What is called 'magic,' is not a vain and chimerical art, as the stoics and epicureans pretend. The names 'Sabaoth' and 'Adonai' were not made for created beings, but belong to a mysterious theology which has reference to the Creator; hence the virtue of these names when they are arranged and pronounced according to rule," &c.

Origen, when speaking thus, is not giving his private opinion; he is but repeating the universal opinion.

All the religions then known admitted a sort of magic, which was distinguished into celestial magic and infernal magic, necromancy and theurgy—all was prodigy, divination, oracle. The Persians did not deny the miracles of the Egyptians, nor the Egyptians those of the Persians. God permitted the primitive christians to be persuaded of the truth of the oracles attributed to the Sibyls, and left them a few other unimportant errors, which were no essential detriment to their religion. Another very remarkable thing is, that the christians of the primitive ages held temples, altars, and images in abhorrence. Origen acknowleges this,

Digitized by Google

(No. 347). Everything was afterwards changed, with the discipline, when the church assumed a permanent form.

FOURTH QUESTION.

When once a religion is established in a state, the tribunals are all employed in perverting the continuance or renewal of most of the things that were done in that religion before it was publicly received. The founders used to assemble in private, in spite of magistrates; but now no assemblies are permitted but public ones under the eyes of the law, and all concealed associations are forbidden. The maxim formerly was, that "it is better to obey God than man;" the opposite maxim is now adopted, that "to follow the laws of the state is to obey God." Nothing was heard of but obsessions and possessions; the devil was then let loose upon the world, but now the devil stays at home. Prodigies and predictions were necessary; now they are no longer admitted: a man who in the places should foretel calamities, would be sent to a madhouse. The founders secretly received the money of the faithful; but now, a man who should gather money for his own disposal, without being authorised by the law, would be brought before a court of justice to answer for so doing. Thus the scaffoldings that have served to build the edifice, are no longer made use of.

FIFTH QUESTION.

After our own holy religion, which indubitably is the only good one, what religion would be the least objectionable?

Would it not be that which should be the simplest? that which should teach much morality and very few dogmas?—that which should tend to make men just, without making them absurd?—that which should not ordain the belief of things impossible, contradictory, injurious to the Divinity, and pernicious to mankind; nor dare to threaten with eternal pains whosoever should possess common sense? Would it not be that which should not uphold its belief by the hand of the execu-

Digitized by Google

tioner, nor inundate the earth with blood to support unintelligible sophisms?—that in which an ambiguous expression, a play upon words, and two or three supposed charters, should not suffice to make a sovereign and a God, of a priest who is often incestuous, a murderer and a poisoner?—which should not make kings subject to this priest?—that which should teach only the adoration of one God, justice, tolerance, and humanity?

SIXTH QUESTION.

It has been said, that the religion of the Gentiles was absurd in many points, contradictory, and pernicious: but have there not been imputed to it more harm than it ever did, and more absurdities than it ever preached?

Show me in all antiquity a temple dedicated to Leda lying with a swan, or Europa with a bull. Was there ever a sermon preached at Athens or at Rome, to persuade the young women to cohabit with their poultry? Are the fables collected and adorned by Ovid religious? Are they not like our Golden Legend, our Flower of the Saints? If some brahmin or dervish were to come and object to our story of St. Mary the Egyptian, who not having wherewith to pay the sailors who conveyed her to Egypt, gave to each of them instead of money what are called 'favours,' we should say to the brahmin—Reverend father, you are mistaken; our religion is not the Golden Legend.

We reproach the ancients with their oracles, and prodigies; if they could return to this world, and the miracles of our Lady of Loretto and our Lady of Ephesus could be counted, in whose favour would be the balance?

Human sacrifices were established among almost every people, but very rarely put in practice. Among the Jews, only Jeptha's daughter and king Agag were immolated; for Isaac and Jonathan were not. Among the Greeks, the story of Iphigenia is not well authenticated; and human sacrifices were very rare among the

Digitized by Google

ancient Romans. In short, the religion of the pagans caused very little blood to be shed, while ours has deluged the earth. Ours is doubtless the only good, the only true one; but we have done so much harm by its means, that when we speak of others we should be modest.

SEVENTH QUESTION.

If a man would persuade foreigners, or his own countrymen, of the truth of his religion, should he not go about it with the most insinuating mildness and the most engaging moderation? If he begins with telling them that what he announces is demonstrated, he will find a multitude of persons incredulous; if he ventures to tell them that they reject his doctrine only inasmuch as it condemns their passions; that their hearts have corrupted their minds; that their reasoning is only false and proud, he disgusts them—he incenses them against himself—he himself ruins what he would fain establish.

If the religion he announces be true, will violence and insolence render it more so? Do you put yourself in a rage, when you say that it is necessary to be mild, patient, beneficent, just, and to fulfil all the duties of society? No; because every one is of your own opinion. Why then do you abuse your brother when preaching to him a mysterious system of metaphysics? Because his sense irritates your self-love. You are so proud as to require your brother to submit his intelligence to yours; humbled pride produces the wrath; it has no other source. A man who has received twenty wounds in a battle, does not fly into a passion; but a doctor wounded by the refusal of your assent, becomes furious and implacable.

EIGHTH QUESTION.

Must we not carefully distinguish the religion of the state from theological religion? The religion of the state requires that the imans keep registers of the circumcised, the vicars or pastors registers of the baptized; that there be mosques, churches, temples, days

7

Digitized by Google

consecrated to rest and worship, rites established by law; that the ministers of those rites enjoy consideration without power; that they teach good morals to the people, and that the ministers of the law watch over the morals of the ministers of the temples. This religion of the state cannot at any time cause any disturbance.

It is otherwise with theological religion: this is the source of all imaginable follies and disturbances; it is the parent of fanaticism and civil discord; it is the enemy of mankind. A bonze asserts that Fo is a God, that he was foretold by fakirs, that he was born of a white elephant, and that every bonze can by certain grimaces make a Fo. A talepoin says, that Fo was a holy man, whose doctrine the bonzes have corrupted, and that Sommona-Codom is the true God. After a thousand arguments and contradictions, the two factions agree to refer the question to the dalai-lama, who resides three hundred leagues off, and who is not only immortal, but also infallible. The two factions send to him a solemn deputation; and the dalai-lama begins, according to his divine custom, by distributing among them the contents of his close-stool.

The two rival sects at first receive them with equal reverence; have them dried in the sun, and enchase them in little chaplets which they kiss devoutly; but no sooner have the dalai-lama and his council pronounced in the name of Fo, than the condemned party throw their chaplets in the vice-god's face, and would fain give him a sound thrashing. The other party defend their lama, from whom they have received good ands; both fight a long time; and when at last they are tired of mutual extermination, assassination, and poisoning, they grossly abuse each other, while the dalai-lama laughs, and still distributes his excrement to whomsoever is desirous of receiving the good father lama's precious favours.

RHYME.

Rhyme was probably invented to assist the memory, and to regulate at the same time the song and the

Digitized by Google

dance. The return of the same sounds served to bring easily and readily to the recollection the intermediate words between the two rhymes. Those rhymes were a guide at once to the singer and the dancer; they indicated the measure. Accordingly, in every country, verse was the language of the gods.

We may therefore class it among the list of probable, that is, of uncertain opinions, that rhyme was at first a religious appendage or ceremony; for, after all, it is possible that verses and songs might be addressed by a man to his mistress before they were addressed by him to his deities; and highly impassioned lovers indeed will say that the cases are precisely the same.

A rabbi who gave me a general view of the Hebrew language, which I never was able to learn, once recited to me a number of rhymed psalms, which he said we had most wretchedly translated. I remember two verses, which are as follows:—

*Hibbitu clare vena haru
Ulph nehem al jeck pharu.

"They looked upon him and were lightened, and their faces were not ashamed."

No rhyme can be richer than that of those two verses; and this being admitted, I reason in the following manner:—

The Jews, who spoke a jargon half Phenician and half Syriac, rhymed; therefore the great and powerful nations, under whom they were in slavery, rhymed also. We cannot help believing, that the Jews who, as we have frequently observed, adopted almost everything from their neighbours, adopted from them also rhyme.

All the orientals rhyme; they are steady and constant in their usages. They dress now as they have dressed for the long series of five or six thousand years. We may therefore well believe that they have rhymed for a period of equal duration.

Some of the learned contend, that the Greeks began with rhyming, whether in honour of their gods, their heroes, or their mistresses; but, that afterwards becoming more sensible of the harmony of their language,

* Psalm xxxiv. 5.

Digitized by Google

having acquired a more accurate knowledge of prosody, and refined upon melody, they made those exquisite verses without rhyme which have been transmitted down to us, and which the Latins imitated and very often surpassed.

As for us, the miserable descendants of Goths, Vandals, Huns, Gauls, Franks, and Burgundians,—barbarians who are incapable of attaining either the Greek or Latin melody,—we are compelled to rhyme. Blank verse, among all modern nations, is nothing but prose without any measure; it is distinguished from ordinary prose only by a certain number of equal and monotonous syllables, which it has been agreed to denominate 'verse.'

We have remarked elsewhere, that those who have written in blank verse have done so only because they were incapable of rhyming. Blank verse originated in an incapacity to overcome difficulty, and in a desire to come to an end sooner.

We have remarked, that Ariosto has made a series of forty-eight thousand rhymes without producing either disgust or weariness in a single reader. We have observed how French poetry, in rhyme, sweeps all obstacles before it, and that pleasure arose even from the very obstacles themselves. We have been always convinced, that rhyme was necessary for the ears, not for the eyes; and we have explained our opinions, if not with judgment and success, at least without dictation and arrogance.

But we acknowledge, that on the receipt at mount Krapak of the late dreadful literary intelligence from Paris, our former moderation completely abandons us. We understand, that there exists a rising sect of barbarians, whose doctrine is, that no tragedy should henceforward be ever written but in prose. This last blow alone was wanting, in addition to all our previous afflictions. It is the abomination of desolation in the temple of the muses. We can very easily conceive, that after Corneille had turned into verse the "Imitation of Jesus Christ," some sarcastic wag might menace the public with the acting of a tragedy in prose, by Floridor and

Digitized by Google

Mondori; but this project having been seriously executed by the abbé d'Aubignac, we well know with what success it was attended. We well know the ridicule and disgrace that were attached to the prose Œdipus of de la Motte Houdart, which were nearly as great as those which were incurred by his Œdipus in verse. What miserable Visigoth can dare, after Cinna and Andromache, to banish verse from the theatre? After the grand and brilliant age of our literature, can we be really sunk into such degradation and opprobrium! Contemptible barbarians! Go then and see this your prose tragedy performed by actors in their riding-coats at Vauxhall, and afterwards go and feast upon shoulder of mutton and strong beer.*

What would Racine and Boileau have said, had this terrible intelligence been announced to them? "Bon Dieu!" Good God! from what a height have we fallen, and into what a slough are we plunged!

It is certain, that rhyme gives a most overwhelming and oppressive influence to verses possessing mere mediocrity of merit. The poet in this case is just like a bad machinist, who cannot prevent the harsh and grating sounds of his wires and pulleys from annoying the ear. His readers experience the same fatigue that he underwent while forming his own rhymes; his verses are nothing but an empty jingling of wearisome syllables. But if he is happy in his thoughts and happy also in his rhyme, he then experiences and imparts a pleasure truly exquisite, a pleasure that can be fully enjoyed only by minds endowed with sensibility, and by ears attuned to harmony.

---

* This is evidently aimed at the English drama; and it may be so far conceded to Voltaire, that a tragedy in French prose—and he somewhat slovenly gets over the medium of blank verse—would be a very defective production. But our author is not to create a general difficulty out of the particular deficiency of his own language.—T.

END OF VOLUME THE FIFTH.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY C. H. REYNELL, BROAD-STREET, GOLDEN-SQUARE.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

APR 10 1917

SEP 22 1918

form 410

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google